DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 228 834 FL 013 576

AUTHOR Clark, John L. D.; Johnson, Dora E.
TITLE A Survey of Materials Development Needs in the Less Commonly Taught Languages in the United States. Final Project Report.
INSTITUTION Center for Applied Linguistics, Washington, D.C.
SPONS AGENCY Department of Education, Washington, D.C. Div. of International Education.
PUB DATE Dec 82
GRANT G-008103239
NOTE 154p.; For a related document, see ED 112 643.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Information Analyses (070)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC07 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Higher Education; Instructional Materials; *Material Development; *Needs Assessment; Nonschool Educational Programs; Postsecondary Education; *Second Language Instruction; Second Language Programs; Surveys; *Uncommonly Taught Languages

ABSTRACT

Materials development needs in the less commonly taught languages were surveyed in order to update an earlier conference report and set priorities for the 1980s. Questionnaires were developed for university department chairpersons, instructors, and business language programs. The survey response data are reported on (1) teaching program structure, (2) instructor background and training, (3) classroom activities, (4) instructional objectives, (5) student assessment procedures, (6) use of instructional materials, and (7) needed instructional materials. Recommendations are made regarding Russian and other Eastern European languages; Arabic and other Middle Eastern languages; South Asian languages; Chinese, Japanese, and other East Asian languages; Southeast Asian languages; and Sub-Saharan African languages. In addition, corporate language training and government language training programs were surveyed. The recommendations address the desirability of more intensive language training in these languages, retraining of students who once had a high level of proficiency, follow-up of program graduates, and development of materials emphasizing communicative skills. Questionnaires and survey forms are appended. (RW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED228834

A SURVEY OF MATERIALS DEVELOPMENT NEEDS IN THE LESS COMMONLY TAUGHT LANGUAGES IN THE UNITED STATES

Final Project Report

Submitted to

U.S. Department of Education
Division of Advanced Training and Research
International Education Programs

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Center for Applied
Linguistics
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

John L. D. Clark
Project Director

Dora E. Johnson
Project Co-Director

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

Center for Applied Linguistics

December 1982

FL 013576

A Survey of Materials Development Needs in the Less Commonly Taught Languages in the United States

Final Project Report

for

Grant No. G008103239
Project No. 017AH10038

Submitted to

U.S. Department of Education
Division of Advanced Training and Research
International Education Programs

John L. D. Clark
Project Director

Dora E. Johnson
Project Co-Director

Center for Applied Linguistics
3520 Prospect Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20007

December 1982

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION..1

PROJECT PLANNING MEETING..4

DEVELOPMENT OF SURVEY INSTRUMENTS................................6

  Initial Telephone Contacts....................................6

  Draft Questionnaire Development and Review....................6

QUESTIONNAIRE FORMAT AND CONTENT.................................8

  Questionnaire for Department Chairpersons.....................8

  Questionnaire for Instructors and Course Report Forms.........9

  Questionnaire for Business Language Programs..................11

QUESTIONNAIRE DISTRIBUTION AND RESPONSE..........................12

SURVEY REVIEW MEETING AND FOLLOW-UP..............................14

SURVEY RESPONSE DATA...16

  Teaching Program Structure....................................16

  Instructor Background and Training............................17

  Classroom Activities and Instructional Objectives.............21

  Assessment Procedures...23

  Use of Instructional Materials................................27

  Needed Instructional Materials................................30

REVIEW COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS..................................36

  Russian and Other Eastern European............................36

  Arabic and Other Middle Eastern...............................43

  South Asian...43

  Chinese...44

  Japanese and Other East Asian.................................44

  Southeast Asian...45

  Sub-Saharan African...46

Table of Contents (cont.)

SURVEY OF CORPORATE LANGUAGE TRAINING..............................48

Questionnaire Distribution and Response..........................50

INSTRUCTIONAL ACTIVITIES AND MATERIALS UTILIZATION IN SELECTED GOVERNMENT LANGUAGE TRAINING PROGRAMS..........................54

Foreign Service Institute..55

Defense Language Institute.......................................59

Central Intelligence Agency......................................59

National Security Agency, National Cryptologic School............65

SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS.......................................68

SELECTED REFERENCES...73

APPENDICES..75

A. Questionnaire for Department Chairpersons

B. Questionnaire for Instructors

C. Course Report

D. Language Questionnaire for Business Corporations

E. Memorandum for Chairpersons of Departments or Administrative Heads in the Less Commonly Taught Languages: "Request for Assistance in Survey of Teaching Materials Needs"

F. Memorandum for Instructors Teaching Courses in Less Commonly Taught Languages in U.S. Colleges and Universities: "Survey of Teaching Materials Needs"

G. Responding Institutions and Languages Represented

H. Memorandum for Personnel Training Directors at Selected U.S. Corporations: "Survey of Foreign Language Teaching Activities and Materials Needs

I. Report Form for Government Agency Language Training

J. Textbooks Reported as Currently being Used, by Language

LIST OF TABLES

1. Questionnaire for Department Chairpersons: Responses to Other than "Materials Needs" Questions........................16

2. Characteristics of Responding Instructors.......................18

3. Judged Relative Importance of Instructional Objectives by Course Level..22

4. Assessment Procedures Used in Beginning Courses.................24

5. Assessment Procedures Used in Intermediate Courses..............25

6. Instructional Materials Used in Beginning Courses...............29

7. Instructional Materials Used in Intermediate Courses............29

8. Material Judged Most Needed in Beginning Courses................32

9. Material Judged Most Needed in Intermediate Courses.............33

10. Instructors Questionnaire: Materials Needed Most...............35

11. Language Training Procedures Reported by Corporate Respondents...51

12. Summary of FSI Course Materials................................56

13. Summary of DLI Course Materials................................60

14. Summary of CIA Course Materials................................63

15. Summary of NSA Course Materials................................66

INTRODUCTION

The persistence of declining enrollments in foreign language study in this country--involving, as an inevitable consequence, a shortage of language-trained individuals in a number of critical areas--has been cause for increasing concern among language teachers and language policy makers alike. The recently-released report of the President's Commission on Foreign Language and International Studies (Perkins, 1979), which criticized American competence in foreign languages as "nothing short of scandalous, and...becoming worse," has created, to at least some extent, a renewed interest on the part of legislators and the general public in the status of language study in the United States. However, most of this interest has been focused on the languages of wider use, such as French, Spanish, and German, with relatively little attention paid to the less commonly taught languages which, ironically, are spoken by the large majority of the earth's population and include such major world languages as Japanese, Chinese, and Russian.

Given the relatively limited resources that are presently and for the foreseeable future available for program development in foreign languages, it becomes crucially important--all the more so in the case of the less commonly taught (LCT) languages--to be able to establish developmental priorities that will help to maximize the effectiveness of these resources with respect to teacher training, instructional materials development, and other aspects of the language learning process. Unfortunately, detailed and accurate information about developmental needs in the less commonly taught languages is diffuse and is usually available only among a relatively small number of people who are themselves teachers of the languages in question or in some other way associated with instructional programs in these languages.

In an effort to make this type of information more readily and more systematically available, the Division of Advanced Training and Research - International Education Programs of the U.S. Department of Education has over the last 23 years commissioned a number of papers to examine the state of the art in the teaching of the less commonly taught languages. This division has also supported a number of conferences and surveys to discuss, assess, and set priorities for the development of textbooks and other instructional materials both within and across languages. The so-called "Kittamaqundi conference" on the less commonly taught languages, held in 1974, brought together about 25 participants for just such a purpose. The resulting conference report, entitled Material Development Needs in the Uncommonly Taught Languages: Priorities for the Seventies (Center for Applied Linguistics, 1975) has served as a major source of information in this area for the past seven years.

In October 1981, the Center for Applied Linguistics (CAL), through a grant from the Department of Education, International Education Programs, began work on a survey project designed to update and supplement the 1975 document. Under this project, a set of survey instruments was designed to solicit opinions from the field concerning needed instructional materials, opinions that--supplemented with review and evaluation by a panel of experts--was intended to provide a basis for setting priorities for materials development during the 1980s.

A major impetus that prompted the earlier 1975 survey was the fact that--despite the existence of reasonably good, and generally informal, lines of communication among instructors, administrators, and others involved in the teaching of a given language or language-group area--there was little or no effective communication concerning the scope and nature of materials development on a more generalized basis, i.e., cutting across individual languages or language groupings within the total field of "less commonly taught languages." Toward this end, a group of nationally-recognized experts was convened to take an informed and, to the greatest extent possible, generalized view of the then-current situation in the LCT language field and to make recommendations concerning materials development priorities on the basis of not only their own detailed knowledge of the situation within their specific language areas but also taking into account expressed needs in other language areas, as identified by the other conference participants. This approach succeeded only partially, in that, notwithstanding the good will with which each of the Kittamaqundi participants addressed this task, the resulting recommendations were still--and in all probability necessarily--expressed in terms of developmental priorities within the specific language or language area with which each of the participants was most familiar and most qualified to make these types of judgments. However, some degree of generalizability was introduced within the framework of the 1975 report in that all participants were asked to make judgments about, and frame their reports in terms of, the relative availability and need for development of each of the so-called "tools of access" (basic texts designed on modern pedagogial principles, introduction to writing system, graded readings of up to "newspaper language" level, bilingual dictionary, reference grammar, and graded tape recordings of up to radio broadcast difficulty) within the language or language areas in question. The Kittamaqundi report thus provided a common format for expressing materials development needs, and to this extent facilitated and objectified the Department of Education's task in identifying the particular materials development projects to receive funding emphasis.

A second limitation of the 1975 report was that it was based, for all practical purposes, on the informed judgments of experts in the field who--although LCT language teachers in their own right, and highly knowledgeable concerning available instructional materials, as well as enrollment trends, curricular developments, and other relevant matters in their language areas--would not necessarily be closely in touch with the expressed needs of a wide variety of other "front-line" teachers in these areas. Although expert judgment and broad-view appraisal of the overall situation within a given language or language group would ultimately be required in any attempt to set developmental priorities for the present survey, detailed opinions of and recommendations concerning materials development on the part of a broad constituency of instructors and department heads in these language areas would be expected to provide useful background information against which the priority judgments could be made on a more fully informed basis.

A third area not formally addressed in the 1975 report was that of language training needs of the U.S. business community. To obtain relevant information in this regard, a separate questionnaire was addressed to a sample of U.S. corporations having business interests or operations involving international trade, requesting information on their language training activities and needs. Also included in the present study report is an overview of language teaching activities and materials availability and use within four government agencies having extensive training programs in less commonly taught languages. Since in many instances, teaching materials used in these programs are also available for public use, information concerning them is quite relevant to the consideration of materials development needs in regular academic settings.

The information obtained in the present survey is considered to follow upon and add further, more recent data in areas previously covered both by the 1975 report and by a number of other surveys and conferences which have detailed the development of materials in the less commonly taught languages. An overview of materials needs surveys and other related projects carried out under the auspices of Section 602 of NDEA Title VI is given in Petrov (1975). Explicit mention should also be made of the recent report of a national task force assembled by the Modern Language Association to study and make immediate and longer-term recommendations concerning needs for teacher training, articulation, materials development, student financial support, long-range planning, and other aspects of the instructional situation in the less commonly taught languages. This report, A National Ten-Year Plan for Teaching and Training in the Less Commonly Taught Languages (Twarog, 1980), makes numerous specific recommendations concerning the relative needs for general development across languages, which would of course have implications for degree of priority to be set for materials development within a given language.

The following sections provide a detailed description of each of the project activities, including (1) general project planning, (2) development and review of the draft survey instruments, (3) distribution of and response to the final instruments, (4) description of obtained questionnaire data and review by project review committee, (5) committee judgments concerning material development priorities, (6) description of business questionnaire results, (6) overview of language training at selected government agencies, and (8) conclusions and recommendations based on all information available to the project.

PROJECT PLANNING MEETING

As specified in the project proposal, a three-person Steering Committee, consisting of Dr. Karl C. Drobnic (Oregon State University), Dr. Richard D. Lambert (University of Pennsylvania), and Dr. Leon I. Twarog (Ohio State University) was established in September 1981, with all three committee members readily agreeing to serve in this capacity. A two-day planning meeting was subsequently held at the CAL offices on October 8-9, 1981. Participants at this meeting included, in addition to the Steering Committee members and the project co-directors, other CAL professional staff members having particular background and expertise in areas relevant to the survey (Dr. G. Richard Tucker, CAL director; and Dr. William W. Gage, senior linguistic consultant to the Center). Dr. Richard T. Thompson, U.S. Office of Education, also attended as observer-participant.

The major portion of the Steering Committee meeting was devoted to a discussion of the overall purpose and strategy of the survey, and the following guidelines were generally agreed to:

(1) For purposes of the survey, the term "teaching materials" should be interpreted in a very broad sense, so as to include not only the usual textbooks, reference grammars, supplementary readers, and so forth but also audio- and video-tape programs and other audiovisual materials, self-instructional programs, materials developed for computer-assisted instruction, and other print and nonprint materials used in teaching the less commonly taught languges in both regular classroom settings and in the context of other "delivery systems" for language instruction.

(2) Although the primary focus of the survey should be on materials development needs within the context of regular academic programs (including area studies and advanced international training programs), some attention should also be paid to the particular needs of language instruction in the international business context, as represented, for example, by specialized language programs for U.S. corporations doing business abroad and/or requiring foreign language capability within their domestic offices. A third area to which it was considered desirable to address some attention was that of government language training, with respect to both the current status of their own instructional materials in the less commonly taught languages and their perceived needs for further materials development.

(3) A "two-tier" approach to the initial drafting, review, and final preparation of the survey instruments was generally agreed to. Specifically, the recommended procedure was to (a) prepare--on the basis of discussions at the Steering Committee meeting and further contacts with other resource persons in the field--initial drafts of the survey questionnaires; (b) distribute the draft materials to a "second tier" of approximately 25-30 language department chairmen, area specialists, business corporation contacts, and others in a position to thoroughly and perceptively review these materials; and (3) revise the instruments as appropriate, prior to large-scale distribution.

(4) Without losing sight of the basic focus of the survey--to address specific materials needs in the less commonly taught languages--it was also considered desirable to obtain a certain amount of information from the respondents concerning: the composition of their language learning "clientele" and their

purposes for language study; the specific instructional objectives of the teaching program; tests or other procedures used to evaluate learning outcomes; and other descriptive aspects of the programs. In addition to being of interest in in its own right, this information would be of considerable assistance in analyzing and drawing useful conclusions concerning the specific materials needs identified in the main portion of the survey.

In addition to discussing and coming to general agreement on the matters outlined above, the Steering Committee members provided the project staff a fairly detailed listing of prospective reviewers for the initial draft of the questionnaires. It was also recommended that, even prior to the actual drafting of the questionnaires, extensive telephone contacts be made with department chairpersons and other resource individuals in the field, both to alert them to the existence of the survey project and to obtain feedback concerning the proposed topical areas to be included in the survey and the ways in which the various survey questions could best be framed.

DEVELOPMENT OF SURVEY INSTRUMENTS

Initial Telephone Contacts

Following the Steering Committee meeting, the suggested telephone contacts were carried out. To guide this activity, the project staff drafted ahead of time a series of provisional questions which it felt should be included in the survey and used this as a general protocol or "talking document" during the actual telephone conversations. However, in all of these conversations, it was emphasized to the respondent that, in addition to reacting to individual questions, he or she should point out any important information aspects that did not appear to be adequately addressed, as well as provide any general observations concerning overall questionnaire format and survey strategy.

In the course of the telephone survey of academic respondents, which extended over a period of several weeks, the project staff contacted and had detailed conversations with approximately 30 undergraduate or graduate level professors, department chairmen, and administrators. Only one person declined to be interviewed, and the great majority of respondents were highly cooperative and helpful in reviewing the content and plans for the survey.

A similar procedure was followed in contacting business corporation representatives for their opinions and suggestions on the content of the business-oriented questionnaire. Approximately 20 telephone interviews were conducted with personnel officers, training officers, or other staff members in selected corporations, drawn from the Fortune 500 list, which were known to have international business activities. In general, these contacts were considerably less productive than those with the academic respondents. Most respondents indicated that there were no clearly articulated programs or policies relating to language training within their own companies, and although a few of the respondents expressed interest in and willingness to cooperate in the survey, many felt there was little need for or benefit to be obtained by such an investigation. Notwithstanding the considerably less informative and useful business-organization contacts, it was nonetheless possible to obtain a reasonable amount of feedback for the design of the draft business questionnaire. In particular, these telephone contacts suggested quite strongly that a survey instrument addressed to the business community would need to differ considerably from that for the academic community, with respect to both the questions asked and their manner of presentation.

Draft Questionnaire Development and Review

Based on the telephone contacts described above and several writing/review sessions by project staff, draft versions of three separate questionnaires were prepared: a Questionnaire for Department Chairpersons, a Questionnaire for Instructors (including both an overview questionnaire and individual Course Reports to be completed by the instructors), and a Questionnaire for Business Language Programs. In February 1982, all draft questionnaires were mailed for review to the Steering Committee members as well as to a total of 37 department chairpersons, language instructors, and other resource persons in the academic area, together with a personally-addressed letter describing the background and purpose of the project and requesting their assistance in reviewing the draft questionnaires. Although it was anticipated that the academic respondents would be most interested in reviewing and reacting to the two academically-oriented questionnaires, the business questionnaire was also included for general information as well as for any comments they might have about it. A preaddressed, postpaid envelope was also included for returning the commented questionnaires.

A similar mailing, but consisting of only the business questionnaire, was sent in early March 1982 to a total of 18 corporations, consisting of those businesses previously contacted by telephone and indicating willingness to cooperate in the survey. A separately prepared cover letter was also included, together with a prepaid return envelope.

In response to the review request, a total of 24 annotated returns were obtained from the academic distribution and 7 from the business distribution. In addition, a number of telephone consultations were held with review copy recipients to clarify or seek expansion of their written suggestions or to obtain feedback by phone from those who had not returned an annotated questionnaire.

Comments on the draft academic questionnaires (for both department chairpersons and individual instructors) were in general quite supportive of both the types of information being sought and the basic format of the instruments. A number of suggestions for more precise wording and/or reformatting of individual questions were given, and these were in most instances incorporated into the final questionnaires.

QUESTIONNAIRE FORMAT AND CONTENT

Facsimile copies of the final operational version of each of the questionnaire instruments are shown as Appendices A through D. As previously indicated, within each of the questionnaires, it was intended to obtain not only information bearing on the respondents' perceived needs for teaching materials development in a particular language field but also, to the extent possible, data on the nature of the instructional programs themselves, including their general structure, teaching approaches, learning objectives, and other program characteristics that would be expected to have an important bearing on the need for, and appropriate design of, various types of teaching materials. To facilitate discussion of survey results in later sections of this report, it will be useful to briefly describe the major content areas of each of the survey instruments, including the underlying rationale for inclusion, where appropriate.

Questionnaire for Department Chairpersons

The questionnaire addressed to department chairpersons (Appendix A) had two major objectives. The first was to obtain information of a summary nature concerning the specific less commonly taught (LCT) language(s) taught within the department and identification of the instructors involved (the latter as an eventual response-rate check on the individual instructor questionnaires). This was accomplished by asking the chaiperson to list, on the lines provided,

> "each course in an uncommonly taught language that is being taught in your department or administrative area during the current academic year (1981-1982). (For purposes of this survey, uncommonly taught languages are all modern languages other than English, French, German, Italian, and Spanish)."

A series of lines were provided for the chairperson to list, for each such course, the language involved, the title of the course, the last name of the instructor (including the chairperson as an instructor wherever relevant) and the course enrollment. The opportunity was also provided for the chaiperson to attach a separate document (such as a department file record) if this was a more convenient way to provide the requested information.

A second major purpose of the chairperson's questionnaire was to obtain an administrator's-level, overview appraisal,

> "across all of the LCT languages and courses taught in your department [of] what in your opinion are the greatest areas of current need with regard to suitable and effective instructional materials."

The respondent was asked to

> "identify the language(s) involved, the type of material needed (e.g., basic textbooks, reference grammars, supplementary reading texts, audiotapes, dictionaries, cultural materials, pronunciation guides, etc.) and indicate the particular characteristics that such material should have in order to be of greatest usefulness and value."

Beyond these two basic questions, several other items of information were requested, including an indication of whether the LCT teaching activities at the institution involved any of the following: intensive language courses (defined as 3 or more hours per day of instruction); computer-assisted instruction; self-study (defined as "student learns the language 'on his/her own,' with teacher involvement limited to occasional assistance, checks on progress, etc."); interterm and/or summer study of the language at the institution; similar study in institution-administered programs abroad; and full-year academic study abroad. Two additional questions were intended to determine whether the department presently had "a system for maintaining contact with LCT language students after they leave the program (beyond the usual institution-wide alumni lists)"; and whether the department presently offered "any LCT language courses explicitly designed for students who have previously studied the language but who have had some proficiency loss through disuse." Answers to the first question were considered of interest as an indication of the extent to which information available at the institutional level might provide "manpower resource" data for the less commonly taught languages; the second question was intended as an indication of the possible need for the development of courses especially designed to bring previously-proficient students quickly and efficiently back to a high level of language competence.

Questionnaire for Instructors and Course Report Forms

Instructors at participating institutions were asked to complete two types of instruments, a short "Questionnaire for Instructors" (Appendix B) and the considerably more detailed "Course Report" form (Appendix C), one of which was requested for "each course in a less commonly taught language that you have been teaching in the current (1981-82) school year." The Questionnaire for Instructors dealt primarily with biographical and academic background information, including the respondent's age; highest academic degree obtained; general field and subject matter of the degree; number of years spent teaching LCT languages; whether or not language teaching is the sole professional activity (and if not, the nature of the other activity); membership in regional or national language organizations; and whether or not the respondent currently has a tenured (or "tenure track") position at the institution.

In addition to these background questions, the Questionnaire for Instructors asked the respondent to indicate, across all of the LCT language courses taught, what he or she considered "the single most urgent need insofar as the development of instructional materials is concerned." The instructor was asked to "identify the language, the type of material needed (e.g., basic textbook, reference grammar, supplementary reading texts, audiotapes, dictionaries, cultural materials, pronunciation guides, etc.)....[and to] also give any relevant information concerning the particular characteristics that this material should have to be of maximum value and usefulness."

The most detailed information about materials needs within the context of particular types of courses was requested as part of the individual Course Reports, for which the relevant question read as follows:

> "What is the greatest current need that you have with regard to suitable and effective instructional materials for this course? Please identify the type of material needed (e.g., basic textbook, reference grammar, supplementary reading texts, audiotapes, dictionaries, cultural materials, pronunciation guides, etc.) and indicate the specific characteristics that such material should have in order to be most useful to you. (Please append a supplementary page if needed.)"

In addition to the basic "needed materials" question above, several other questions were asked concerning a variety of characteristics of the course, including the title of the course and the language involved; the general type of course (defined as "beginning," "intermediate," "advanced," "literature," "special-purpose," and "other"); total contact hours; and number of hours per week devoted to various types of activities (including "group classroom contact with instructor," "group classroom contact with native speakers or resource persons other than instructor," "individual tutorial" sessions, required or optional "language laboratory attendance," and "other formally scheduled learning activities."

With respect to teaching materials currently being used in the course, the respondent was asked to provide the title, edition, publisher, and date of publication of "the primary textbook (if any) used in this course" or, if a basic textbook was not being used, to describe instead "the materials that carry the major teaching burden in the course." An overall quality rating of the textbook or other materials was also requested on a four-point scale ("excellent," "good," "fair," and "poor"), and the respondent was asked to "describe briefly those aspects of the text (or other materials) that result in this judgment."

In addition to information on the primary text for the course, identification of and quality ratings of any supplementary materials used in the course (defined as "reference grammars, additional reading texts, English/target language or target-language/English dictionaries, pronunciation guides, etc.") were requested. Information was also requested on whether or not any audiotapes were used in conjunction with the course and, if so, whether these were provided by the textbook publisher in coordination with a printed text, obtained from commercial sources but not specifically coordinated with the textbook, or prepared on a local basis. Questions were also addressed to the use or lack of use of other audiovisual materials (videotapes, movies, slides/filmstrips) and of computer capabilities ("Do students work with a computer in any way in connection with their study for this course?").

With regard to instructional objectives, respondents were asked to rate, using a four-point scale ranging from "of great importance" to "of little or no importance," the relative importance of ten different course objectives "for the particular course being described." Objectives to be rated included:

"Development of listening comprehension skill

Development of speaking skill

Development of orthographic skills

Development of reading proficiency

Development of general writing ability

Familiarity with and appreciation of important classical literary works in the language

Familiarity with and appreciation of contemporary literary works in the language

Knowledge of the civilization and formal culture of the target language country(ies)

Knowledge of the informal ('way-of-life') culture of the target language country(ies)

Other (describe)"

A final question asked the instructor to indicate whether each of a series of possible assessment procedures was used to evaluate "student attainment of the course objectives."

"General observation of student performance during the course

Paper-and-pencil quizzes prepared by the instructor

End-of-term written examination prepared independently by the individual instructor

End-of-term examination prepared on a department-wide basis (or by individual instructors following a specified department-wide model)

"Textbook tests" published as part of the textbook or textbook package

Externally-prepared standardized test

A test of knowledge of and/or sensitivity to the customs and culture of the foreign language country

Face-to-face speaking proficiency interview such as the Foreign Service Institute (FSI)-type interview or other formalized conversation-based test

A speaking test in which the student records his or her responses on tape

A test of listening comprehension, in which the student must indicate comprehension of the target language as spoken by the instructor or given on a tape recording

Other testing procedure (please describe)"

Each respondent was also invited to use lines provided and/or an appended page to give "any further comments about this course that would help to describe its objectives, teaching techniques, assessment procedures, teaching materials or materials needs, or to give any other information relevant to the project."

Questionnaire for Business Language Programs

This four-page questionnaire is described in greater detail in the "Survey of Corporate Language Training" section (pages 48-53).

QUESTIONNAIRE DISTRIBUTION AND RESPONSE

Following final revision and printing of the questionnaires, individual packages of survey materials were prepared for mailing to individual language departments. Each package contained a memorandum addressed to "Chairpersons of Departments or Administrative Heads in the Less Commonly Taught Languages" (Appendix E); one copy of the Questionnaire for Department Chairpersons; five copies of a separate memorandum addressed to "Instructors Teaching Courses in Less Commonly Taught Languages in U.S. Colleges and Universities" (Appendix F), together with an equal number of copies of the Questionnaire for Instructors; and nine copies of the individual Course Report form.

The chairperson's memorandum briefly described the background for and nature of the survey, indicating that its major purpose was to "determine the nature, availability, and extent of use of textbooks, reference grammars, audiovisual aids, and other instructional materials used in teaching less commonly taught languages in the United States....[and to] attempt to identify and bring to attention the lack of, or shortcomings that may exist in, available teaching materials in a particular language." The assistance requested of the chairperson was that of "(1) completing and returning to us the enclosed 'Questionnaire for Department Chairpersons' and (2) distributing, to instructors who have been currently teaching (1981-82) one or more LCT language courses in your department, the explanatory materials and survey forms also included in this package, with the request that they complete these materials and return them directly to us at the project office." The "less commonly taught languages" were defined as "all current world languages other than English, French, German, Italian, and Spanish." An "instructor" was considered to be "anyone having primary responsibility for teaching a class group" and did not include "native speakers who provide additional language practice or other 'resource persons' beyond the regular teacher." Assurances were given that all project data would be analyzed and reported on a basis that would not permit the association of the detailed results with any given individuals or institutions. Larger institutions for which the number of provided questionnaire copies was insufficient were asked to reproduce additional copies locally or telephone the project office for an additional supply. Although the instructor-addressed materials were designed as "stand-alone" documents, chairpersons were requested to add their own "short cover note (or verbal message)" to the instructor materials as an "important additional reinforcement of the value and significance of the survey."

The instructor memorandum provided background information generally similar to that contained in the chairperson's questionnaire and indicated that individual instructors at the participating institutions were being asked to provide "fairly detailed information about the specific courses that they are teaching, with special attention to the nature of the course and its objectives, the instructional materials used and, very importantly, their judgments about instructional materials that need to be developed within the context of these courses." Return mailing labels addressed to the project office were also included.

The mailing lists for questionnaire distribution included primarily the Modern Language Association's most recent computer listing of department chairpersons at two- and four-year colleges and universities in the United States, together with the Department of Education's September 1981 directory of national language resource centers (area studies centers) and a small number of additional individuals identified by the project staff or by members of the project Steering Committee. With respect to the MLA list, the entire database was searched for all modern language departments other than English, French, Spanish, German, and Italian, and mailing labels were prepared which, in the great majority of instances, addressed the department chairperson by name. A total of 865 survey packages, each containing the materials described in the preceding section, were distributed by first class mail on April 22, 1982, with the request that the recipients adhere to a mid-May target date (or earlier if possible) for return of the completed forms. Respondents were encouraged to call or write the project offices if they had any questions concerning the survey or the details of their participation in it.

The rate of questionnaire return, as of the last two weeks of May, was quite modest (completed chairperson's and/or instructors' questionnaires returned from approximately 17 percent of the departments surveyed). In an attempt to increase the return rate and in anticipation of the planned midsummer meeting of a larger group of Steering Committe members and other resource persons to review and assist in interpretation of the survey results, a short follow-up memorandum was mailed on June 3rd to those departments which had not yet responded as of that date. This memorandum reminded the recipient of the original survey mailing and indicated that, in recognition of other activities at the institution that may have prevented a response by the original target date, the survey period had been extended to June 18, 1982 and that "questionnaires returned on or close to this date can still be tabulated and included in the project analysis." It was also offered to send any needed copies of the survey materials immediately upon phone request to the project office.

As a result of this follow-up mailing, the response rate increased somewhat over the next several weeks so that, as of the July 9th date of the survey review and discussion meeting, questionnaire materials had been received from approximately 23 percent of the original survey mailing list.

SURVEY REVIEW MEETING AND FOLLOW-UP

Although a major objective of the survey was to assemble detailed information concerning perceived needs for materials development on the part of "front-line" instructors and administrators, it was also considered important to obtain a more generalized and more highly synoptic appraisal of the obtained data with respect to various trends that might be identified in them by persons highly familiar with the languages or language groups involved and with prior materials development needs and activities in these areas. In order to assist in obtaining this needed broader perspective, a ten-person review committee was established, consisting of the Steering Committee members and seven additional participants, as follows:

Dr. Albert Dien, Stanford University - (Asian/Chinese)
Dr. Charles Gribble, Ohio State University - (Slavic and East European)
Dr. Franklin Huffman, Cornell University - (Southeast Asian)
Dr. Eleanor Jorden, Cornell University - (Asian/Japanese)
Dr. Carolyn Killean, University of Chicago - (Middle Eastern)
Dr. Richard Lambert, University of Pennsylvania - (South Asian)
Dr. Grace Mancill, American University - (Language for Special Purposes)
Dr. Rosane Rocher, University of Pennsylvania - (South Asian)
Dr. Leon Twarog, Ohio State University - (Slavic and East European)
Dr. David Wiley, Michigan State University - (Sub-Saharan African)

Dr. Richard T. Thompson and Mrs. Julia A. Petrov also attended (as observer-participants) the one-day meeting of the review committee which was held at the Center for Applied Linguistics on July 13, 1982. All of the above persons were present with the exception of Dr. Charles Gribble, who was traveling out of the country. However, Dr. Gribble reviewed the survey results and other project materials and provided relevant information by mail and through telephone conversations.

In preparation for the review meeting, project staff prepared tabulations of the response data for all questionnaires returned prior to the meeting date, in a form generally similar to that shown in Tables 4 through 10, and mailed this material to the committee members in advance of the meeting. In addition to tabulating numerical data from the various questionnaire items, project staff reproduced verbatim for the committee any written ("fill-in") comments concerning needed instructional materials that expanded to any extent upon the numerically coded information. Many of these comments were quite detailed and showed evidence of considerable reflection and diligence in answering on the part of the respondents.

In reviewing the survey results available at the time of the meeting, an initial consideration on the part of the committee was the extent to which responses for a given language or language group could be considered representative of the overall "field" in that area. To assist in this determination, listings of all institutions and departments responding to the survey, by language, were provided, and individual committee members reviewed these for their own language areas. In general, it was felt that for certain languages, including Russian, Arabic, Japanese, and Chinese, responses had, for the most part, been received from the major institutions involved in the teaching of these languages. However, for several other areas, including especially the

Southeast Asian, South Asian, and Sub-Saharan African language groupings, it was considered that a number of institutions known to have training programs in these areas were not yet represented in the survey. It was therefore recommended by the committee that a third mailing of survey materials be sent to each of several targeted institutions, to be specified by the committee member(s) representing the language areas in question, with the strong request that the institution participate in the survey. To add further weight to this effort, Dr. Richard Thompson agreed to provide a cover memorandum over his signature stating, among other things, that "[since] your department has been identified as having a critically important teaching program....it would therefore be of substantial assistance to the Department of Education, in analyzing the results of the survey and planning its programmatic activities over the next several years, to have the language program and associated materials development needs of your department adequately represented in the survey data." A revised deadline of September 15, 1982 was designated for return of the questionnaires, of which additional copies were provided, along with copies of the original descriptive memoranda, in the follow-up mailing packets distributed on July 29, 1982. To insure that Department of Education area studies center directors had all received notification of the survey and been provided the opportunity to respond, a similar mailing was sent to those area centers which had not returned the survey materials as of that date.

The additional July mailing resulted in an appreciable increase in returns, which were subsequently processed and tabulated along with the questionnaires returned from the earlier mailings. With respect to overall response rates, across all three questionnaire distributions, a total of 967 separate departments were contacted, of which 50 responded that no LCT languages were currently (1981-82) being taught in their departments. Of the remaining 917 departments, completed chairperson's questionnaires and/or individual course reports were received from 249 departments, or 27.2% of the total. Appendix G gives an alphabetical listing of all responding institutions and the languages represented in the questionnaire returns for that institution.

In interpreting the survey results, a number of cautions must be kept in mind concerning the nature of the response data. First, to the extent that the MLA listing of department chairpersons--together with the list of area studies center directors and supplementary listings provided by the Advisory Board members for individual languages or language areas--may not have fully reflected the totality of academic institutions offering training in the less commonly taught languages, some institutions legitimately includable in the theoretical population may not have been included in the distribution of survey materials. Second, although the total response rate is generally in keeping with the return percentages obtained in voluntary-response surveys of this type (for example, the return rate for the MLA Task Force Survey on the Uncommonly Taught Languages was approximately 25 percent), the response data are necessarily based on those departments willing to participate in the project. Third, in analyzing the data with respect to individual languages or language groups, the actual number of responses to a particular question for a given language should be carefully considered since, in some instances, especially for the higher-level courses, the total response frequency is relatively low. The base Ns for individual language groupings are shown on the appropriate data tables in each instance.

SURVEY RESPONSE DATA

This section describes and discusses the responses obtained for the academic portion of the survey. Information obtained with respect to the business corporation survey and government agency overview is presented in subsequent sections.

Before addressing the survey responses with respect to expressed needs for materials development, it will be useful to describe briefly the information obtained from those portions of the survey addressed to other aspects of the teaching situation for the less commonly taught languages, including the general structure of the teaching programs, background and training of instructors, and the teaching procedures and objectives of LCT courses.

Teaching Program Structure

With respect to language training program structure, chairpersons were asked to indicate whether each of several types of language teaching activities were carried out for any LCT languages offered in their department. As shown in Table 1, relatively few chairpersons (23%) reported that "intensive" language courses (defined as 3 or more hours per day of instruction) were being offered in their department. Somewhat more (36%) indicated that interterm and/or summer language study at the institution was offered in addition to the regular academic year courses. Opportunities for summer or interterm study abroad were provided in 22% of the responding departments, and in 20%, a full-year study abroad program.

Table 1

Questionnaire for Department Chairpersons
Responses to Other Than "Materials Needs" Questions
(N=223)

	Yes	No	No Answer
Intensive LCT language courses (3 or more hours/day)	23%	72%	4%
Computer-assisted instruction	7	88	5
Self-study	26	70	5
Interterm/summer study at the institution	36	60	4
Interterm/summer study abroad	22	74	4
Full-year study abroad	20	77	4
System for maintaining contact with graduated students	8	88	4
Courses explicitly designed for "attrition" students (see text)	11	83	6

With respect to instructional techniques other than the regular classroom teacher/student interaction, 26% of the respondents reported that self-study opportunities were provided (defined as "student learns the language 'on his/her own,' with teacher involvement limited to occasional assistance, checks on progress, etc."). Written comments on this question indicated that in many instances the "self-study" activity involved independent work in advanced reading courses or literature-oriented courses, rather than self-training in basic language skills through tape recorded drills or other "programmed" means.

A total of 7% of the responding chairpersons indicated current use of computer-assisted (CAI) instruction in their departments. Written comments to this question mentioned operational CAI programs in Russian, Japanese, Swedish, Armenian, and Lingala. The most frequently cited applications of computer technology were in connection with vocabulary learning, grammar drill, and reading comprehension development. These results are in keeping with an earlier survey by Olsen (1980) which found essentially the same pattern of CAI utilization for postsecondary language departments generally.

To determine whether any special learning provisions were being made for previously-proficient LCT students in need of "refresher" training (as distinguished from enrollment in the regular language course sequence), the question was asked "Does your department offer any LCT language courses explicitly designed for students who have previously studied the language but who have had some proficiency loss through disuse?" Eleven percent of the respondents indicated that such courses were offered, but the write-in comments suggested that in several instances the courses in question were simply part of the regular program sequence (e.g., an "intermediate" course offered in the fall term and making allowances for lack of language use over the summer recess) rather than specially designed and targeted courses of the type intended in the original question. A few specialized courses were described, including, for example, a summer refresher course in Hindi for "academics and other professionals" who have had "little opportunity to use their Hindi since their latest stay in the field [and are attempting to] update their proficiency before departing for India for research or diplomatic or social service."

Only 8% of the responding chairpersons indicated that their department had "a system for maintaining contact with LCT language students after they leave the program (beyond the usual institution-wide alumni lists)." In most instances, this was described as consisting of personal contacts, informal correspondence, occasional newsletters, and other relatively unstructured procedures, rather than a detailed, ongoing process. To the extent that up-to-date information on the location and availability of graduates of LCT programs would be of relevance to "human resource" monitoring and programmatic planning within these language areas (a strong recommendation of the MLA Task Force on the Uncommonly Taught Languages), there would appear to be an identified need in this regard.

Instructor Background and Training

The "Questionnaire for Instructors," which accompanied and supplemented the individual course report questionnaires, was intended to gather certain basic information concerning the academic background, years of teaching experience, and other relevant characteristics of the instructors whose teaching activities and opinions on materials development needs were represented in the individual course reports. Table 2 shows the total (across-languages) response to these

Table 2

Characteristics of Responding Instructors

	Total	Western European	Russian	Other East European	Arabic	Other Middle East & North African	South Asian	Chinese	Japanese	Other East Asian	South-east Asian	Sub-Saharan African
Years teaching uncommonly-taught language(s):												
Mean	11.5	6.9	14.8	9.3	9.7	11.4	11.7	12.9	11.3	17.3	13.0	8.5
Range	1-36	1-25	1-35	1-30	1-34	1-26	1-23	1-30	1-32	10-23	1-32	1-36
S.D.	7.40	6.32	8.17	7.11	6.10	7.48	6.59	8.35	7.63	5.12	9.81	8.73
N	(507)	(48)	(115)	(48)	(16)	(37)	(23)	(77)	(84)	(6)	(27)	(26)
Language teaching sole professional activity?												
Yes	29%	40%	49%	23%	38%	19%	9%	45%	33%	17%	30%	15%
No	71	60	51	77	62	81	91	55	67	83	70	85
Number responding	(505)	(47)	(115)	(47)	(16)	(37)	(23)	(77)	(84)	(6)	(27)	(26)
Age:												
25 and under	100%	100%	100%	100%	-	-	-	100%	100%	-	-	-
Over 25	99	96	98	94	100%	100%	-	98	99	-	-	100%
Over 30	93	78	95	90	95	97	100%	94	90	-	100%	92
Over 35	79	54	85	81	64	89	78	80	77	-	97	65
Over 40	59	36	65	55	45	54	65	71	53	-	79	42
Over 45	45	28	55	38	32	32	93	49	43	100%	64	23
Over 50	31	20	45	17	19	27	39	32	24	50	45	15
Over 55	18	12	29	11	13	16	17	18	11	33	26	15
Number responding	(507)	(49)	(115)	(47)	(16)	(37)	(23)	(77)	(84)	(6)	(27)	(26)
Highest academic degree:												
Through high school	100%	-	100%	-	-	-	-	-	100%	-	-	100%
Through B.A.	99	100%	98	100%	100%	100%	-	100%	99	100%	-	96
Through M.A.	92	80	96	96	94	94	100%	92	91	83	100%	92
Through Ph.D.	62	41	68	72	44	69	96	53	48	83	92	73
Number responding	(501)	(49)	(115)	(46)	(16)	(36)	(23)	(75)	(83)	(6)	(26)	(26)

Table 2 (continued)

Characteristics of Responding Instructors

	Total	Western European	Russian	Other East European	Arabic	Other Middle East & North African	South Asian	Chinese	Japanese	Other East Asian	South-east Asian	Sub-Saharan African
Field of highest academic degree:												
Literature	18%	29%	21%	17%	13%	19%	13%	30%	27%	0%	0%	4%
Linguistics/Language education	47	43	35	49	44	30	57	36	46	67	89	81
Area studies	19	12	34	26	13	19	22	18	12	0	0	0
Other humanities	15	14	9	9	31	32	9	14	15	33	11	15
Non-humanities	1	2	2	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0
Number responding	(504)	(49)	(112)	(47)	(16)	(37)	(23)	(77)	(84)	(6)	(27)	(26)
Membership in professional language organization(s):												
One or more listed	71%	65%	73%	83%	88%	70%	70%	79%	77%	33%	81%	54%
None listed	29	35	27	17	12	30	30	21	23	67	19	46
Tenured or tenure-track position:												
Yes	65%	35%	82%	62%	53%	57%	74%	57%	57%	100%	85%	65%
No	35	65	18	38	47	43	26	43	43	0	15	35
Number responding	(505)	(49)	(114)	(47)	(15)	(37)	(23)	(77)	(84)	(6)	(27)	(26)

retention difficulties associated with departmental budget reductions, tenure controversies, and other administrative constraints suggests, at the same time, a reduced likelihood of adding younger staff in these areas within the near-term future.

Classroom Activities and Instructional Objectives

In addition to seeking information directly related to teaching material utilization and needs, the course report questionnaires included several other questions concerning the general nature of the course and its instructional objectives. A basic question addressing the "level" of the course included the following possible response categories:

Beginning - introductory course intended for students having no prior study of or exposure to the language

Intermediate - follow-on course for students who have acquired the rudiments of the language via the beginning course or equivalent outside study/exposure

Advanced - "beyond-intermediate" course aimed at further increasing student skills in listening, speaking, reading, or writing the language (e.g., composition and conversation course)

Literature - course that may involve some proficiency-oriented instruction but is primarily intended to develop student knowledge and appreciation of literary works in the language

Special-purpose - course intended to teach the language for a specific academic, business, or personal application (e.g., "Ching documents," "language for airline personnel," "language for travel abroad," etc.)

Other - course that does not fit adequately into any of the preceding categories.

Across all codeable course reports received, the number of questionnaires by level was: beginning, 384; intermediate, 219; advanced, 127; literature, 63; special-purpose, 47; and other, 21.

A question intended to determine the total number of course contact hours ("Please give the total number of classroom contact hours for the entire course") was apparently misinterpreted by a number of respondents who supplied figures that appeared to represent the number of credit hours carried by the course or the number of hours per day or week that the class met, rather than the intended total contact hours. A related result was to render problematical the detailed analysis of the immediately-following question asking for the number of hours per week devoted to each of several types of activity, such as "group classroom contact with instructor," "individual tutorial," etc., since in the absence of the total number of course hours these figures would be very difficult to interpret.

A second question, addressing the instructional objectives of the course, was, however, much more readily interpretable. For this, the respondent was asked to indicate the "relative importance" (from the standpoint of the par-

Table 3

Judged Relative Importance of Instructional Objectives by Course Level

Beginning		Intermediate		Advanced		Literature	
Development of listening comprehension skill	3.61*	Development of reading proficiency	3.60	Development of reading proficiency	3.67	Development of reading proficiency	3.67
Development of speaking skill	3.50	Development of listening comprehension skill	3.46	Development of listening comprehension skill	3.33	Knowledge of formal culture of country	3.35
Development of reading proficiency	3.39	Development of speaking skill	3.43	Development of speaking skill	3.32	Familiarity with classical literary works	3.26
Development of orthographic skills	2.99	Development of orthographic skills	3.08	Development of general writing ability	3.12	Familiarity with contemporary literary works	3.15
Knowledge of informal culture of country	2.70	Knowledge of informal culture of country	2.89	Development of orthographic skills	3.01	Knowledge of informal culture of country	2.96
Development of general writing ability	2.63	Development of general writing ability	2.86	Knowledge of informal culture of country	2.97	Development of general writing ability	2.64
Knowledge of formal culture of country	2.28	Knowledge of formal culture of country	2.64	Knowledge of formal culture of country	2.91	Development of speaking skill	2.55
Familiarity with contemporary literary works	1.44	Familiarity with contemporary literary works	1.89	Familiarity with contemporary literary works	2.39	Development of listening comprehension skill	2.40
Familiarity with classical literary works	1.40	Familiarity with classical literary works	1.72	Familiarity with classical literary works	2.13	Development of orthographic skills	2.29

*On scale of 4 = "of great importance" to 1 = "of little or no importance."

ticular course being described) of each of several listed teaching objectives, based on a four-point scale ranging from "of great importance" to "of little or no importance." Table 3 shows, for "beginning," "intermediate," "advanced," and "literature" courses, in order of decreasing importance, the average rankings (based on "of great importance" = 4; "quite important" = 3; "of some importance" = 2; of "little or no importance" = 1) of each of the objectives listed. Across beginning, intermediate, and advanced courses, the three course objectives considered least important are (in decreasing order) "knowledge of the civilization and formal culture of the target language country(ies)"; "familiarity with and appreciation of contemporary literary works in the language"; and "familiarity with and appreciation of important classical literary works in the language." At the other end of the scale, development of general proficiency in listening comprehension, speaking, and reading are the three most highly rated objectives across all three course levels. Within these three objectives, development of listening comprehension skill is ranked first at the beginning level, followed by speaking and reading; at intermediate and advanced levels, the development of reading proficiency assumes primary importance, followed rather closely by listening and speaking (in that order). The development of "general writing ability" is ranked fairly low at both beginning and intermediate levels, and assumes somewhat more prominence for the advanced courses, where it is rated at 3.12 on the average (barely above the "quite important" level).

The ranking of instructional objectives for literature courses is seen to follow a somewhat different pattern, with reading proficiency again at the top of the scale, but with knowledge of formal culture, familiarity with classical and contemporary literary works, knowledge of the informal culture of the country, and development of general writing ability constituting, in that order, the next five rankings. Development of speaking and listening comprehension are at the bottom of the scale, along with "development of orthographic skills."

Assessment Procedures

A fairly detailed question on the various assessment procedures used in the course was also included, both for general information and for comparison with the stated instructional objectives. Responses to this question are shown separately for beginning (Table 4) and intermediate (Table 5) levels, both for the total respondent group for that level and for individual language areas. (Total responses to this question for the advanced and literature courses were, in general, too few to warrant separate tabulation by language.)

As would be anticipated, across both course levels, "general observation of student performance during the course" is the most frequently cited assessment procedure (99% of the total respondents in both instances), followed by "paper-and-pencil quizzes prepared by the instructor" (95% and 91% for beginning and intermediate courses, respectively) and "end-of-term written examination prepared independently by the individual instructor" (85% and 89%). For both beginning and intermediate levels, use of an "end-of-term written examination prepared on a department-wide basis (or by individual instructors following a specified department-wide model)" was infrequently mentioned (17% and 16%, respectively). A positive response to this question would be expected to hinge, in large part, on the existence of a sufficient number of instructors in that language within the department to justify a joint examination-preparation effort. The relatively larger number of department-wide examinations reported for beginning Russian courses (32%) and beginning Western European language

Table 4

Assessment Procedures Used in Beginning Courses

	Total	Western European	Russian	Other East European	Arabic	Other Middle East & North African	South Asian	Chinese	Japanese	Other East Asian	South-east Asian	Sub-Saharan African
General observation of performance	99%	97%	98%	100%	100%	97%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Paper and pencil quizzes	95	86	98	95	100	100	83	100	98	100	86	85
Instructor-prepared written exam	85	66	80	94	92	94	78	93	90	100	81	81
Department-wide written exam	17	22	32	0	13	14	6	17	13	0	7	12
"Textbook tests"	10	15	8	17	13	14	11	9	9	0	13	4
Externally-prepared standardized test	3	0	1	3	0	4	6	8	5	0	0	0
Customs/culture test	16	15	13	13	25	8	18	18	14	40	18	28
Face to face speaking test	39	33	33	10	38	16	35	55	59	0	60	46
Tape-recorded speaking test	20	27	16	18	13	31	24	31	16	0	6	16
Listening comprehension test	65	70	59	43	78	56	72	78	83	40	67	54
Range of Ns	(321-371)	(32-36)	(72-83)	(27-35)	(8-12)	(25-31)	(17-19)	(35-46)	(56-62)	(5-6)	(15-21)	(23-27)

Table 5

Assessment Procedures Used in Intermediate Courses

	Total	Western European	Russian	Other East European	Arabic	Other Middle East & North African	South Asian	Chinese	Japanese	Other East Asian	South-east Asian	Sub-Saharan African
General observation of performance	99%	100%	100%	100%	91%	92%	100%	100%	98%		100%	100%
Paper and pencil quizzes	91	91	93	100	91	85	86	88	95	INSUFFICIENT DATA	83	87
Instructor-prepared written exam	89	91	84	100	82	77	86	89	93		100	80
Department-wide written exam	16	10	24	0	18	20	0	17	19		10	14
"Textbook tests"	5	0	5	0	18	11	0	0	10		0	0
Externally-prepared standardized test	4	0	5	0	0	0	0	3	10		0	0
Customs/culture test	21	18	14	24	55	33	43	22	14		10	27
Face to face speaking test	39	40	27	0	45	22	57	50	48		40	56
Tape-recorded speaking test	22	30	22	31	0	22	17	24	21		10	25
Listening comprehension test	55	70	49	44	73	50	57	58	61		45	44
Range of Ns	(190-213)	(10-11)	(41-47)	(15-17)	(11)	(9-13)	(6-7)	(30-35)	(42-45)		(10-12)	(14-16)

courses (22%) by comparison to the other language areas (0% - 17%) may be reflective of this fact. The measurement consideration at issue is that, wherever this is possible, across-instructor collaboration in preparing course examinations may be expected to have a positive and synergistic effect on content and testing procedures, by comparison to the possibly more cursory and idiosyncratic test preparation by individual instructors.

Although the development of proficiency in listening comprehension was judged by the respondents as the most important and second most important teaching objective for beginning and intermediate courses, only 65% of the beginning course and 55% of the intermediate course instructors indicated that they made use of "a test of listening comprehension, in which the student must indicate comprehension of the target language as spoken by the instructor or given on a tape recording." With respect to the testing of speaking ability, the positive responses to both "face-to-face speaking proficiency interview such as the Foreign Service Institute (FSI)-type interview or other formalized conversation-based test" and to "a speaking test in which the student records his or her responses on tape" were quite a bit higher (especially for the former) than would have been anticipated. For both beginning and intermediate courses, 39% of the responding instructors indicated that they gave a "face-to-face speaking proficiency interview" of an FSI- or other formalized type. Although the direct testing of speaking proficiency by means of a structured interview such as that originally developed by the Foreign Service Institute has within the past two or three years begun to be known to and used to some extent by the academic community, this has been for the most part within the larger-volume languages (principally French and Spanish), and would in no event approach the frequency of use suggested by the response data. A more appropriate explanation of the survey results for this question is probably that the question was quite liberally interpreted by the respondents to include any type of general conversation with the students as constituting a "proficiency interview," notwithstanding the intended emphasis on highly formalized procedures in the original question.

The frequency of administration of "a speaking test in which the student records his or her responses on tape" was also surprisingly high--20% and 22% for beginning and intermediate courses. It is doubtful that this number of respondents would have prepared or otherwise have available to them formally-designed tape-based speaking tests; again, a possible interpretation is that the question was liberally interpreted to include a variety of language laboratory exercises requiring spoken responses on the students' part but that did not necessarily involve a highly formalized "examination" process.

"Textbook tests," defined in the questionnaire as "[those] published as part of the textbook or textbook package," are very rarely used by the respondents in either beginning (10%) or intermediate (5%) courses. This is probably in large part a reflection of the fact that, except for pro forma, quiz-type exercises of dubious technical quality or instructional value, textbooks and other teaching programs in both higher-volume and LCT languages have tended to place little or no emphasis on providing appropriate assessment materials as part of the total instructional package. This is rather unfortunate in that the development of suitable tests on a one-time, uniform basis as an integral part of the textbook preparation effort would constitute a considerably more efficient and cost-effective approach to the assessment of course achievement than the current approach of placing this responsibility, for all practical purposes, on the many individual teachers using the text materials.

Tests of "knowledge of and/or sensitivity to the customs and culture of the foreign language country" are reported as being used in 16% of the beginning LCT courses and 21% of the intermediate courses; this appears generally in keeping with the relative importance accorded this area as a course objective at both levels.

The assessment of developed proficiency in the language by means of a an "externally-prepared standardized test" was, by all odds, the least frequently reported testing procedure at both beginning and intermediate levels (3% and 4%, respectively). Absolutely no use of such tests was reported for Western European, Arabic, Other East Asian, Southeast Asian, and Sub-Saharan African languages at the beginning level and for the same languages plus Other East European, Other Middle East and North African, and South Asian at the intermediate level. This is undoubtedly a reflection of the fact that, with the known exceptions of the Japanese Proficiency Test, developed in 1979 through a grant from the Japan-U.S. Friendship Commission, and the MLA-Cooperative Proficiency Tests for Teachers and Advanced Students in Russian (developed in 1961 and no longer readily available), there are currently available no objective, non-curriculum specific, standardized tests of functional proficiency in the less commonly taught languages. (A standardized test of listening comprehension and reading proficiency in Chinese is under development through a grant from the Department of Education, but will not be available for general use until the spring of 1984.) In the absence of such external-to-program assessment instruments, oriented in both format and content to determining the student's ability to function appropriately in real-life language use settings, evaluation of the effectiveness or lack of effectiveness of the language programs being conducted at individual institutions (or, on as group basis, within the United States generally) will continue to be both extremely difficult and of doubtful accuracy and validity.

Use of Instructional Materials

Several questions in the course report sought information on the type and nature of use of instructional materials currently being used in the course. These questions included a request for identification of the "title, edition, publisher, and date of publication of the primary textbook (if any) used in this course"; a listing of any supplementary materials used (and giving as examples reference grammars, additional reading texts, dictionaries, and pronunciation guides); an indication of whether any audiotapes were used in the course and, if so, whether these were "provided by the textbook publisher and designed to closely coordinate with the printed textbook," "provided by a commercial publisher but not specifically coordinated with the textbook," or "locally-prepared"; identification of any audiovisual materials other than audiotapes used "on a regular basis" in the course; and an indication of whether "students work with a computer in any way in connection with their study for this course."

Tables 6 and 7 show the total and individual language area responses to these questions for beginning and intermediate levels, respectively. For both levels, and as would be expected, a substantial majority of the courses make use of a published textbook. However, there is a clear differentiation in extent of textbook use across the two levels in that, for all language area categories, with the single exception of Arabic (for which textbooks were used in all reported courses at both levels), the percentage of textbook use is higher at the beginning level than at the intermediate level. For all language groups combined, textbook use drops from 89% to 82%; for individual language areas, the greatest decrease in textbook use is reported for Western European (92% to 64%) and Other East European (92% to 65%) languages, while the other areas decline only slightly or moderately (for example, Russian 95% to 90%; Chinese 98% to 91%). Appendix J is a bibliographic listing of all textbooks reported used, by language.

Conversely, for the total respondent group and for most of the individual language areas, the use of supplementary materials is more extensive at the intermediate than at the beginning level (63% to 56% overall). The same general trend--decrease in textbook use and increased use of supplementary materials--also continues at the advanced level, at least insofar as the total group data (N = 127) are concerned, as summarized below:

	Beginning	Intermediate	Advanced
Textbook use	89%	82%	51%
Supplementary materials use	56%	63%	64%

Audiotapes are fairly extensively used at both beginning and intermediate levels. In beginning courses, the audiotapes are predominantly commercially published and explicitly coordinated with the textbook (57%) rather than locally-prepared (39%) or commercially published without relationship to a particular textbook (4%). The frequency of use of "textbook audiotapes" decreases systematically from beginning (57%) to intermediate (41%) to advanced (15%), while the use of locally-prepared tapes rises slightly at the intermediate level and decreases substantially in advanced courses (39%, 44%, 29%). Commercially prepared audiotapes not associated with specific textbooks continue to be used very infrequently at both intermediate (7%) and advanced (4%) levels.

Reasonably extensive use is made of other audiovisual materials such as videotapes, movies, and slides/filmstrips in beginning courses (31%), with progressively decreasing utilization at the intermediate (26%) and advanced (16%) levels. Write-in responses concerning "other audiovisual materials" indicate that for the most part these materials are being used to provide additional cultural information. Except for a single reference to a video-based teaching program in Japanese, there were no references to the use of video technology for language training per se.

A total of 5% of the beginning level courses have the students "work with a computer" in connection with their language study (corresponding figures for intermediate and advanced are 4% and 2%). Across all three levels, the only language areas for which any such use is reported are West European, Russian, Other East European, Japanese, and Sub-Saharan African. Written resposes to this question identify: grammar and vocabulary drills for first and/or second year Russian (Stanford, Rollins College, University of Iowa, and University of California - Riverside); several semesters of Russian on the PLATO system (University of Illinois - Urbana); a computer-assisted Swedish grammar program (University of California - Santa Barbara; a reading program for Japanese kanji (Chaminade University of Honolulu); and English-target/target-English vocabulary drill in Lingala (Indiana University - Bloomington). In addition, several respondents indicated that they were investigating the possibility of introducing CAI courses or were seeking grant support for CAI development.

Table 6

Instructional Materials Used in Beginning Courses

	Total	Western European	Russian	Other East European	Arabic	Other Middle East & North African	South Asian	Chinese	Japanese	Other East Asian	South-east Asian	Sub-Saharan African
Textbook	89%	92%	95%	92%	100%	87%	74%	98%	98%	67%	86%	85%
Supplementary Materials	56	64	49	67	50	55	68	62	53	33	43	56
Textbook Audiotapes	57	56	69	75	92	35	37	60	81	2	48	44
Other Commercial Audiotapes	4	5	5	3	0	6	3	4	0	0	0	11
Locally-Prepared Audiotapes	39	33	38	47	8	58	58	43	24	17	57	41
Other A-V Materials	31	42	29	31	17	23	37	34	34	17	33	41
Use of Computer	5	11	6	3	0	0	0	0	10	0	0	15
Base N	(382)	(36)	(85)	(36)	(12)	(31)	(19)	(47)	(62)	(6)	(21)	(27)

Table 7

Instructional Materials Used in Intermediate Courses

	Total	Western European	Russian	Other East European	Arabic	Other Middle East & North African	South Asian	Chinese	Japanese	Other East Asian	South-east Asian	Sub-Saharan African
Textbook	82%	64%	90%	65%	100%	79%	71%	91%	93%		85%	81%
Supplementary Materials	63	73	69	76	45	64	100	63	44	INSUFFICIENT DATA	54	81
Textbook Audiotapes	41	27	49	6	73	21	0	49	56		23	31
Other Commercial Audiotapes	7	27	8	0	0	21	0	0	9		0	6
Locally-Prepared Audiotapes	44	55	8	0	0	21	57	0	9		38	50
Other A-V Materials	26	18	29	24	0	7	29	37	29		38	50
Use of Computer	4	18	4	0	0	0	0	0	2		0	19
Base N	(219)	(11)	(49)	(17)	(11)	(14)	(7)	(35)	(45)		(13)	(16)

Needed Instructional Materials

In the course report, the question used to determine the instructors' judgments concerning needed instructional materials was an open-ended question phrased as follows:

> What is the greatest current need that you have with regard to suitable and effective instructional materials for this course? Please identify the type of material needed (e.g., basic textbook, reference grammar, supplementary reading texts, audiotapes, dictionaries, cultural materials, pronunciation guides, etc.) and indicate the specific characteristics that such material should have in order to be most useful to you. (Please use a supplementary page if needed.)

Use of a free-response format for this question (rather than a check-off listing of materials) was intended to encourage the instructor to reflect more deeply about the question and to produce an answer that, to the extent possible, would not be guided by a priori decisions by the project staff concerning the probable nature of these materials. On the other hand, a completely open-ended question without at least some indication of the kinds of materials that might be considered was also felt to be inadvisable. A "mixed" question format was therefore adopted, in which a limited number of examples were provided as an indication of the general scope of possibilities, without, however, restricting the response possibilities to these particular items.

For the 895 course reports returned, project staff examined each response to the "needed materials" question and coded the answers with respect to the type of material described. In those instances when more than one type of material was mentioned, the item identified by the respondent as being of primary importance was taken as the "greatest current need"; in a few instances in which a priority indication was not given by the respondent, the first-mentioned item was so considered. Tables 8 and 9 show the tabulated responses for beginning and intermediate courses, respectively. Type of material is shown in the left-most column and includes any item mentioned with a frequency of 5% or more for any language area grouping.

As indicated, textbooks are, overall, the most frequently mentioned "greatest current need" at both beginning and intermediate levels (41% and 30%, respectively). Across language areas, instructors in beginning courses in Southeast Asian (59%), Western European (56%), and Other Eastern European (50%) languages considered textbooks their greatest current need, while beginning-level teachers of Sub-Saharan African (35%) and Other Middle Eastern and North African (28%) languages and of Russian (29%) cited textbooks considerably less frequently as constituting their most-needed course material. On an individual language area basis, the expressed need for textbook materials decreases appreciably at the intermediate level (by comparison to the beginning level) in Western European languages, Arabic, Other Middle Eastern and North African languages, and Southeast Asian languages; and remains generally on a par for Other East European languages, South Asian languages, Chinese, Japanese, and Sub-Saharan African languages. An appreciable increase in the judged need for textbook materials at the intermediate level by comparison to the beginning level is seen only for Russian.

Although for most language areas at both beginning and intermediate levels, textbooks are the most frequently indicated "most needed" instructional materials by comparison to the other materials categories, the moderate absolute percentages shown for textbooks (ranging from 59% down) indicate that in many instances, some other type of instructional material was considered of greatest current need in the reported courses.

For beginning courses, reference grammars were considered of greatest developmental importance by 8% of the respondents overall. There is, however, appreciable variation across language groups, with, for example, only 3% of the Russian respondents so indicating, as compared to 13% of the respondents for Western European languages and Other Eastern European languages. The expressed need for supplementary reading materials varies from 0% for Arabic to 25% for South Asian languages.

The expressed need for dictionaries of any type—English/target, target/English, or "other"—does not appear to be great either on an overall basis or for individual language groups. A primary need for "other" types of dictionaries was mentioned by 7% of the Other Eastern European and 8% of the South Asian instructors, but in most instances, the "dictionary categories" are blank or show figures of around 3 or 4%. In a few instances, as indicated by the comments of review committee members, there are lacunae in the availability of specific types of dictionaries for individual languages (for example, target language-English dictionary for Burmese). These are described under relevant language headings in the "Review Committee Recommendations" section.

The development of audiotapes was considered of greatest current importance by 11% of the respondents overall, with most of the individual language areas represented at somewhat varying frequencies. Although recommendations for the development of videotapes or other types of A-V material were less frequent (8% overall) than for audiotapes, 10% of the beginning Russian instructors, 22% of the Arabic, 12% of the Other Middle Eastern and North African, and 16% of the Japanese instructors considered this their primary materials development need.

The need for other types of materials was reported with considerably lower frequencies overall, but with occasional higher peaks for certain languages or language groups. The availability of additional cultural materials was considered the most important need by 11% of the Russian respondents and 7% of the Japanese, and supplementary materials for developing speaking proficiency were considered most important by 11% of the Arabic respondents and 17% of the Sub-Saharan African instructors.

Computer software for language training purposes, although not highly rated overall (2%) was explicitly mentioned by 3% of the Russian, 3% of the Chinese, and 4% of the Japanese instructors as the most important current materials need.

Materials needs expressed by instructors of intermediate-level LCT language courses are summarized in Table 9. As previously indicated, textbooks are, on the whole, more frequently mentioned as the "greatest current need" (30%) than are any other type of material, but at a somewhat lower total frequency than for the beginning level (41%). Generally stable or declining needs for intermediate-level textbooks are shown for most of the individual language areas, with the salient exception of Russian, in which 41% of the intermediate-level respondents considered textbook development the most important materials need, as compared to only 29% of the beginning-level instructors.

Table 8

Material Judged Most Needed in Beginning Courses

	Total	Western European	Russian	Other East European	Arabic	Other Middle East & North African	South Asian	Chinese	Japanese	Other East Asian	South-east Asian	Sub-Saharan African
Textbook	41%	56%	29%	50%	44%	28%	42%	46%	40%	17%	59%	35%
Reference grammar	8	13	3	13	11	8	0	10	04	17	0	9
Supplementary reading materials	12	9	16	7	0	16	25	13	9	17	6	9
Audiotapes	11	3	13	7	0	12	8	10	4	33	12	17
Videotapes, other A-V	8	3	10	0	22	12	8	5	16	0	6	4
L1-L2 dictionary	2	0	0	3	0	4	0	0	4	0	6	4
L2-L1 dictionary	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	0	4
Other dictionaries	3	3	1	7	0	4	8	3	2	0	0	4
Cultural materials	2	3	11	0	0	4	0	0	7	0	0	0
Pronunciation guide	2	6	4	0	0	4	0	5	0	0	0	0
Computer software	2	0	3	0	11	0	0	3	4	0	0	0
Workbook/exercise book	2	0	0	3	0	0	8	0	0	0	0	0
Graded materials	1	0	0	3	0	0	8	0	0	0	0	0
Supplementary speaking materials	4	0	1	0	11	8	0	0	2	0	6	17
Base N	(318)	(32)	(70)	(30)	(9)	(25)	(12)	(39)	(55)	(6)	(17)	(23)

Table 9

Material Judged Most Needed in Intermediate Courses

	Total	Western European	Russian	Other East European	Arabic	Other Middle East & North African	South Asian	Chinese	Japanese	Other East Asian	South-east Asian	Sub-Saharan African
Textbook	30%	25%	41%	53%	0%	18%	40%	50%	40%		33%	31%
Reference grammar	12	13	11	7	20	9	40	11	10	INSUFFICIENT DATA	11	0
Supplementary reading materials	13	25	19	0	20	18	0	14	17		22	13
Audiotapes	7	13	19	7	0	0	0	11	7		11	13
Videotapes, other A-V	5	13	3	0	20	0	0	0	7		11	6
L1-L2 dictionary	5	0	0	0	40	0	0	0	0		11	0
L2-L1 dictionary	10?	0	0	7	0	0	0	4	0		0	0
Other dictionaries	8	13	0	13	0	36	0	4	3		0	19
Cultural materials	1	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	3		0	
Computer software	1	0	0	7	0	0	0	0	0		0	0
Self-study materials	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	0	0		0	0
Graded materials	2	0	0	7	0	9	0	0	0		0	6
Supplementary speaking materials	2	0	0	0	0	9	0	0	7		0	6
Base N	(165)	(8)	(37)	(15)	(5)	(11)	(5)	(28)	(30)		(9)	16

The indicated need for reference grammars as a priority item in intermediate courses varies somewhat across language areas, decreasing (from beginning level figures) in Arabic, Other Middle Eastern and North African, and Southeast Asian; increasing in Russian and (slightly) in Chinese; and remaining essentially stable in the remaining language areas. Supplementary reading materials assume relatively greater prominence as an intermediate-level developmental need in Western European, Russian, Arabic, Japanese, and Southeast Asian languages.

The development of audiotapes is considered the greatest materials need by 7% of the intermediate-level respondents overall. Across language areas, the Western European, Russian, Chinese, Southeast Asian, and Sub-Saharan African respondents assign relatively higher priorities in this regard. In general, language areas for which instructors expressed a priority need for videotapes or other A-V materials at the beginning level continue to show a similar, though for the most part reduced, need at the intermediate level.

The indicated priority need for dictionaries rises overall for intermediate courses by comparison to the beginning level data, especially for "other" dictionaries, which instructors considered of the highest developmental priority in 13% of the Western European and Other East European courses, 19% of the Sub-Saharan African courses, and 36% of the Other Middle Eastern and North African courses. The remaining materials categories (cultural materials, computer software, material designed for self-study, progressively sequenced learning materials, and supplementary speaking materials) are much less frequently indicated as priority items, both overall and for individual language areas.

Although responses to the materials-needs question appearing on the individual course reports are considered to provide the most detailed and focused information about instructor-expressed materials needs for specific instructional levels, additional, somewhat more general, information is provided by a materials-related question included on the instructors' cover questionnaire, which read as follows:

> Across all the less-commonly-taught language courses that you teach, what do you consider the single most urgent need insofar as the development of instructional materials is concerned? Please identify the language, the type of material needed (e.g., basic textbook, reference grammar, supplementary reading texts, audiotapes, dictionaries, cultural materials, pronunciation guides, etc.). Please also give any relevant information concerning the particular characteristics that this material should have to be of maximum value and usefulness. (Attach a separate sheet if desired.)

Table 10 summarizes the responses to this question both by total group and language area. The observed percentages are considered to corroborate, although from a somewhat broader perspective, the instructor judgments reported in the course questionnaires, and are included here for general information.

Table 10

Instructors Questionnaire: Materials Needed Most

	Total	Western European	Russian	Other East European	Arabic	Other Middle East & North African	South Asian	Chinese	Japanese	Other East Asian	South-east Asian	Sub-Saharan African
Textbook	46%	51%	46%	64%	54%	43%	44%	52%	35%	36%	38%	42%
Reference grammar	11	12	4	16	8	17	0	8	8	18	15	17
Supplementary reading materials	12	20	13	5	15	3	25	6	20	9	8	8
Audiotapes	5	0	9	2	0	7	0	6	5	9	0	17
Videotapes, other A-V	4	2	9	0	0	7	0	6	9	0	8	4
L1-L2 dictionary	3	2	1	2	0	7	6	2	3	0	8	0
L2-L1 dictionary	4	0	0	5	0	3	6	5	0	18	8	4
Other dictionaries	4	0	0	5	8	10	0	6	1	9	4	0
Cultural materials	1	5	3	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	0
Pronunciation guide	2	2	2	0	8	3	0	3	0	0	0	0
Computer software	1	0	3	0	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Self-study materials	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	0	0	0	0	0
Graded materials	2	0	3	0	0	0	6	0	10	0	0	4
Supplementary speaking materials	2	0	1	0	0	0	6	2	0	0	8	4
N =	(440)	(41)	(91)	(44)	(13)	(30)	(16)	(64)	(79)	(11)	(26)	(24)

REVIEW COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

As described in the "Survey Review Meeting" section, members of the project review committee met in July 1982 to review the survey data that had been obtained by that time and to make observations concerning the information secured in the survey, both in and of itself and in light of their own backgrounds in and general overview knowledge of the teaching situation and status of materials development for specific languges in their areas of expertise. As indicated during the meeting, it was generally felt that for several of the languages represented in the survey (principally Russian, Arabic, Japanese, and Chinese), an adequate number of responses had been obtained from the major institutions teaching these languages to permit useful inferences to be made from these data (although securing additional responses through a follow-up mailing was also recommended). For other language areas, especially Southeast Asian, South Asian, and Sub-Saharan African languages, it was noted that a number of institutions known to have current programs in these languages were not represented in the returned data, and it was recommened that these specific institutions be contacted and strongly urged to participate in the survey. A third mailing of survey materials was subsequently carried out, resulting in an appreciable increase in returns for the targeted language areas (for example, for Southeast Asian languages, returns were received from all institutions known by the review committee to be teaching Burmese, Khmer, Lao, and, with the exception of one institution, Thai), with an overall response rate increase of approximately 4 percent (final response rate: 27.2%).

The general observations of the review committee members concerning the current availability and development needs for instructional materials in the language areas for which they considered themselves qualified to make judgments are summarized below and are based on (1) review and discussion of relevant survey data at the July 1982 meeting; (2) review through correspondence of the final (third-mailing augmented) statistical results for the survey with respect to both total and individual language area data, (3) review of additional written comments by the questionnaire respondents (beyond those already considered at the July meeting); and (4) correspondence and/or conference telephone calls with the project staff concerning the interpretation of these data.

Review committee observations are not shown for the Western European language grouping because the individual committee members did not consider themselves qualified to make informed judgments in this particular area. For each of the other language areas, committee member observations and recommendations, based on consideration of the survey results and in light of their own background in and knowledge of these language areas, are shown below.

Russian and Other Eastern European

Advisory Committee members familiar with teaching materials and instructional priorities in Russian and other Eastern European languages were of the fairly strong opinion that, in the case of Russian, materials of at least adequate and in some instances quite high quality are currently available in all of the basic categories (basic texts, second- and third-year texts, dictionaries, readers, etc.). It was felt that the commercial publishing sector was likely to provide any relevant additional materials without special support, including better readers (currently in preparation), a more complete Russian-English dictionary, and a dictionary of colloquial Russian.

For the other Eastern European languages, a "status of materials" table was prepared, showing, for each language, the current situation within that language with respect to the availability and general quality of each of the five categories of materials: textbooks and related basic course materials; reference grammars, target language to English dictionaries; English to target language dictionaries; bibliographies on the language; first-level readers; self-instructional materials; second-year texts; and (for Slavic languages only), specialized reading courses for students who already know Russian. Shown below is a summary of the judged status of materials in each of these categories for the following languages: Albanian, Armenian, Belorussian, Bulgarian, Czech, Estonian, Georgian, Hungarian, Latvian, Lithuanian, Macedonian, Modern Greek, Polish, Romanian, Russian, Serbo-Croatian, Slovak, Slovenian, and Ukrainian.

Materials status is indicated by the following categories:

(1) No materials exist or existing materials are almost completely unsatisfactory.

(2) Existing materials are unsatisfactory, but can be used with difficulty.

(3) Existing materials are useful, but should be improved, expanded, or increased.

(4) Existing materials are completely satisfactory, or sufficiently so that special development support is not recommended.

Basic Courses

Category 1

Belorussian
Macedonian
Slovenian

Category 2

Albanian
Slovak

Category 3

Armenian
Bulgarian
Modern Greek
Hungarian
Latvian
Lithuanian

Category 4

Czech
Estonian
Georgian

Polish
Romanian
Serbo-Croatian
Ukranian

Reference Grammars

Category 1

All languages not under categories 2-4

Category 2

Macedonian

Category 3

Czech (forthcoming)
Estonian
Modern Greek
Hungarian
Polish

Category 4

Bulgarian (forthcoming)
Lithuanian (forthcoming)

Target Language to English Dictionaries

Category 1

Albanian
Belorussian
Georgian
Macedonian

Category 2

Czech
Slovak

Category 3

Armenian
Estonian
Modern Greek
Latvian
Lithuanian
Romanian
Slovenian

Category 4

Bulgarian
Hungarian
Polish
Serbo-Croatian
Ukrainian

English to Target Language Dictionaries

Category 1

Albanian
Belorussian
Georgian
Macedonian
Slovak

Category 2

(none)

Category 3

Armenian
Czech
Estonian
Modern Greek
Latvian
Lithuanian
Romanian
Slovenian
Ukrainian

Category 4

Bulgarian
Hungarian
Polish
Serbo-Croatian

Bibliographies

Except for Slovenian (category 4), all are category 1.

First-level Readers

Category 1

Belorussian
Czech
Georgian
Latvian
Macedonian
Slovak
Slovenian

Category 2

Albanian
Bulgarian
Lithuanian
Serbo-Croatian
Ukrainian

Category 3

Armenian
Estonian
Modern Greek
Hungarian
Polish

Category 4

Romanian

Advanced-level Readers

Czech (forthcoming), Estonian, Modern Greek, and Polish are category 3; all others are category 1.

Self-instructional Materials

Except for Georgian and Polish (both category 4), all are category 1.

Second-Year Texts

All are category 1 (Polish in preparation).

Reading Courses for Students of Russian

Category 4 for Czech and Bulgarian (latter forthcoming); all other Slavic languages: category 1.

Considering the known availability and general quality of instructional materials as indicated above, three levels of developmental priority were established. These are shown below, and are based in large part on the assumption that where materials of reasonable quality already exist for particular languages, the creation of improved materials in these languages should be given lower priority than the development of basic materials in languages for which there are presently no such resources.

Highest Priority

Basic Courses

Albanian
Slovak

Reference Grammars

Armenian (East)
Czech
Estonian
Modern Greek
Hungarian
Romanian
Serbo-Croatian
Slovak
Slovenian
Ukrainian

Target Language to English Dictionaries

Albanian
Armenian
Czech
Georgian
Slovak

English to Target Language Dictionaries

Albanian
Slovak

Bibliographies

All languages other than Slovenian

Self-Instructional Materials

Bulgarian
Czech
Modern Greek
Hungarian
Romanian
Serbo-Croatian
Slovak
Ukrainian

Reading Courses for Students of Russian

All Slavic languages other than Czech and Bulgarian

Second Priority

Basic Courses

Belorussian
Macedonian
Slovenian

Reference Grammars

- Belorussian
- Georgian
- Latvian

Target Language to English Dictionaries

- Belorussian
- Macedonian

English to Target Language Dictionaries

- Armenian
- Georgian
- Slovenian

First-level Readers

- All languages (other than Russian)

Second-Year Texts

- Bulgarian
- Czech
- Modern Greek
- Hungarian
- Polish
- Romanian
- Serbo-Croatian
- Ukrainian

Third Priority

Basic Courses

- Latvian

Reference Grammars

- Macedonian

Target Language to English Dictionaries

- Slovenian (presently-existing dictionary unsatisfactory)

English to Target Language Dictionaries

- Belorussian
- Czech (unsatisfactory one exists)
- Georgian
- Macedonian

Advanced-level Readers

All languages

Second-year Texts

All languages not listed as second priority

An additional third-priority category was considered to be contrastive analyses in all languages, though not to the same degree in all instances. (For example, much more is available for Serbo-Croatian and Hungarian than for the other languages.)

Arabic and other Middle Eastern

Despite the availability of several basic textbooks for Arabic, the fact that nearly half of the survey respondents for this language noted the development of textbooks as being a principal need is considered to be a reflection of a substantial shift in instructional goals within the field. Currently-available texts focus primarily on reading and writing, whereas the most recent interest in the field has been toward the development of speaking proficiency in formal literary Arabic. The first priority in Arabic is therefore considered to be the development of speaking-oriented materials at the basic course level. These materials should not be restricted to the conventional textbooks and audiotape formats, but should take advantage of the instructional capabilities of videotape and computer-assisted instruction.

A second priority need in Arabic is for the development of intermediate-and advanced-level English-Arabic dictionaries geared to native English-speaking students.

With respect to other Eastern European languages, appropriate instructional materials for Hebrew are considered to be generally available, including both basic textbooks and supplementary readers. For Modern Persian, acceptable beginning and intermediate textbooks are available; suitable dictionaries are considered a primary need, especially English-Persian. Priority materials needs for Turkish include dictionaries of all types (presently-available dictionaries are inadequate), as well as intermediate-level textbooks. For all Middle Eastern languages, development of audiovisual aids and computer-assisted instruction is viewed as highly important.

South Asian

Based on the reported high percentage of use of suppementary materials for South Asian languages (as well as the expressed need for textbooks), it may be inferred that there is a widespread dissatisfaction with available texts. It is suggested that, for the more commonly taught South Asian languages (Hindi, Urdu, Tamil, and to a lesser extent Bengali), advanced level materials are needed as an area of priority, especially graded readers and graded audiotapes. The high reported frequency of in-house preparation of audiotapes is considered to corroborate the general nonavailability of suitable taped materials from external sources.

For the less widely taught South Asian languages, basic and intermediate level texts are considered of primary importance. Since advanced-level study in these languages often takes the form of individual tutoring (because of the small number of students involved), it may not be cost-effective or particularly helpful to develop advanced-level textbooks in these languages. For all South Asian languges (including Hindi) there are no externally-prepared, standardized tests of student proficiency, an important developmental need in its own right.

Chinese

The high level of expressed need for Chinese textbooks obtained in the survey was viewed as more reflective of a general lack of knowledge of available resources on the part of the respondents than as a justified and documented materials development need. A great number of Chinese texts and other materials have already been developed, and although these materials may be by no means perfect, they have served quite adequately in a variety of contexts. Instead of recommending the immediate development of new materials in Chinese, it is considered more appropriate and ultimately more productive to formulate--on a principled basis and through the medium of professional meetings at regional and national levels--systematic critiques of currently-available texts, including detailed specification of the improvements that need to be made to them.

At least some of the expressed dissatisfaction with present materials may stem from indecision or ambivalences about the form of the language to be taught (PRC or Taiwan), the degree to which the vocabulary of PRC political culture should be part of the basic instruction, and how the two scripts should be handled. Current confusion about the anticipated student outcomes of the instruction (for example, development of reading ability vs. listening comprehension and speaking proficiency) must also be clarified before it will be possible to develop carefully-designed textbooks and other materials that explicitly and effectively address the intended goals.

A related activity should be the development of standards of achievement at each of the different stages of learning, so that instructors in beginning, intermediate, and higher-level classes will have a clear understanding of what is to be accomplished by the end of each level. The promulgation of, and profession-wide agreement concerning, these standards should be accompanied by the preparation of corresponding diagnostic achievement tests as well as tests of developed proficiency in functional language use. Until the intended outcome goals of Chinese language instruction are more clearly specified, and procedures established for assessing progress toward these goals, additional textbook or other materials production is not considered advisable. However, once such instructional guidelines and assessment instruments are available, development of highly focused and highly effective materials will be greatly aided.

Japanese and Other East Asian

As is the case with Chinese, there is a quite large number of Japanese texts and other basic teaching materials available in the field, and although these may not be of the highest quality in all respects, instructors nonetheless have in these materials the wherewithal to present viable courses. An updated beginning textbook, although not so great a priority as for languages in which no such materials exist, would be welcome, and audiovisual materials (including videotapes) designed to present current and culturally relevant language situations, is another recommended area for development. Supplementary reading texts that are culturally authentic and based on contemporary materials are also needed. Although a standardized proficiency test of Japanese listening comprehension and reading has been available for the past three years, it is not yet well known or widely used. Availability of this instrument should be more widely publicized.

With regard to other East Asian languages, review committee members did not consider themselves well qualified to offer judgments. However, East Asian departments at Harvard and the University of Kansas responded at some length, with the following indications of materials needs and priorities. For Korean: an integrated series of textbooks is needed, including materials for teaching the written language, at elementary through advanced levels. Also recommended is a Sino-Korean - English dictionary. At present, to find the meaning of a Sino-Korean compound, the student must look up the pronunciation of each character in a standard "okp'yŏn" and then find the word in a Korean-English dictionary--a complex and time-consuming process that could avoided if such a dictionary were available.

For Manchu, a reference grammar in English is much needed, as well as a series of annotated translations of Manchu documents. Audiotapes of Manchu speakers should also be made for both reference and teaching purposes. For Mongolian, a Khalkha-English dictionary adequate for reading newspapers, literature, and scholarly writing is needed, as is a concise Khalkha reference grammar.

Southeast Asian

In priority order, recommended materials development activities for Burmese are as follows: (1) readers, at all levels; (2) intermediate spoken materials; (3) dictionaries; (4) beginning textbook emphasizing spoken language (a basic text, published in 1968, does exist, but is not very satisfactory). For Khmer, suitable texts are for the most part already available; one exception is intermediate spoken materials, but this should be considered a fairly low priority in view of other languages for which much less instructional material is available. Indonesian is also considered one of the "better-served" Southeast Asian languages in terms of available materials.

Lao is very infrequently taught (apparently only at the University of Hawaii), and there are available both a Lao-English dictionary and (through FSI) a set of Lao training materials. A Spoken Lao Course has been developed in experimental form by Chrisfield; this should be reviewed for possible publication. Although there is little demand for Lao from university students, there may be increasing interest on the part of individuals involved in various refugee assistance activities.

For Thai, no intermediate texts emphasizing the spoken language currently exist; this should be considered a priority for development. A beginning reader is available but is felt to be inadequate for the purpose. Development of a new reader or revision of the existing one would be a second level priority. Beginning-level texts for Thai are available but somewhat unsatisfactory. Revision or new development of a basic Thai text would be a third priority.

For Vietnamese, the Jorden FSI Vietnamese Basic Course is considered the only pedagogically acceptable set of materials for beginning spoken Vietnamese. However, both the text and tapes are in southern Vietnamese, with the current preference rather strongly for northern (Hanoi) pronunciation. Intermediate spoken materials are available, as are intermediate and advanced readers. The only suitable beginning-level reader, published in 1961, is out of print and is quite dated in content, since it treats only pre-revolutionary culture and literature. A good Vietnamese-English dictionary is available (and currently being expanded), and an English-Vietnamese dictionary is being developed under an NEH grant. Priority materials for Vietnamese would thus be a beginning-level reader and a basic text and supporting audiotapes in the northern dialect.

Across Southeast Asian languages generally, the most important materials development needs may be summarized as follows: (1) intermediate spoken textbooks and audiotapes for Burmese, Lao, and Thai; (2) beginning readers for Burmese, Lao, Thai, and Vietnamese; (3) Target language/English dictionaries for Burmese; (4) English/target language dictionaries for Burmese, Lao, Thai, and Vietnamese; (5) intermediate and advanced readers for Burmese and Lao; and (6) revised beginning spoken materials for Burmese, Lao, Thai, and Vietnamese.

Sub-Saharan African

A thoroughgoing needs analysis for materials development in Sub-Saharan African languages has recently been issued under the auspices of the African Studies Center at Michigan State University (Wiley and Dwyer, 1980). The recommendations in the report come from a conference of African language and area specialists. Listed are 84 key African languages which require "prompt development of materials." These languages are grouped into four categories. Group A lists 23 languages which need materials for use in classroom instruction. Group B lists 30 languages whch need materials development for individualized instruction. Group 3 (31 languages) are of lesser priority than Group B. Group D is considered all other languages.

The Wiley-Dwyer report states that African language materials are woefully lacking. Intermediate texts are available for only a few of the major languages. The 1980 conferees also suggest that African languages will probably often be taught through individualized or self-instruction. The development of basic tools of access should thus meet user needs.

The recommendations arising from the report--including both the particular languages for which materials development should be carried out on a priority basis and the types of instructional materials considered most crucial in this regard--were reconfirmed as being timely and valid for purposes of the present survey, and it was suggested that the 1980 recommendations be fully incorporated into the present report.

Group A Languages (Highest Priority)

1. Akan (Twi/Asante/Akuapem/Fante)
2. Amharic
3. Arabic
4. Chewa/Nyanja
5. Fula (Fulfulde/Peulh)
6. Hausa
7. Igbo
8. Kongo
9. Malagasy
10. Mandingo (Bambara/Mandinka/Dyula)
11. Ngala (Lingala)
12. Oromo (Galla)
13. Ruanda/Rundi (Kirwanda/Kirundi)
14. Sango
15. Shona
16. Somali
17. Sotho/Tswana (Ndebele)
18. Swahili
19. Tigrinya
20. Umbundu
21. Wolof
22. Xhosa/Zulu/Swazi
23. Yoruba

Group B Languages (Second Priority)

1. Anyi/Baule
2. Bamileke
3. Bemba
4. Berber (Tamazight/Tamacheq/Kabylle)
5. Chokwe/Lunda
6. Efik/Ibibio
7. Ewe/Mina/Fon
8. Ganda (Luganda)
9. Gbaya
10. Kalenjin (Nandi/Kipsigis)
11. Kamba (Kikamba)
12. Kanuri
13. Kikuyu
14. Krio/Pidgin (Cluster)
15. Luba (Chiluba)
16. Luhya
17. Luo (Acholi/Lango
18. Makua (includes Lomwe)
19. Mbundu (Kimbundu)
20. Mnede/Bandi/Loko
21. Mongo/Nkundo
22. More/Mossi
23. Nubian
24. Senufo
25. Songhai
26. Sukuma/Nyamwezi
27. Tiv
28. Tsonga (Shitsonga/Ronga or Shironga/Tswa or Shitswa)
29. Yao/Makonde (Bulu)
30. Zande (Azande)

Group C Languages (Third Priority)

1. Dinka (Agar/Bor/Padang)
2. Edo (Bini)
3. Gogo (Chigogo)
4. Gurage
5. Hehe
6. Idoma
7. Igbira
8. Ijo
9. Kpelle
10. Kru/Bassa
11. Lozi (Silozi)
12. Maasai
13. Mauritian Creole
14. Meru
15. Nama (Damara)
16. Nuer
17. Nupe
18. Nyakusa
19. Nyoro
20. Sara
21. Serere/Sine (Serer)
22. Sidamo
23. Soninke
24. Suppire
25. Susu
26. Temne
27. Tumbuka (Chitumbuka)
28. Turkana/Teso
29. Venda

Group D Languages (Fourth Priority)

All Other Languages*

---

*Note: The 1980 report does not include Afrikaans, English, French, Portuguese, and Spanish in this priority listing, even though a number of speakers in Africa utilize these languages of European origins. Ge'ez, an archaic literary language of Ethiopia, is also omitted from consideration.

SURVEY OF CORPORATE LANGUAGE TRAINING

As previously described, the development in draft form, review, and distribution of a survey questionnaire for business corporations followed the same general procedures and timelines as for the academic survey. However, the content and focus of the corporate questionnaire differed in several respects from those of the academic questionaires. First, it was considered important, as an item of basic information, to determine which of four possible "delivery systems" were being used for the training; these were operationally defined in the questionnaire as follows:

(1) In-house language training ("the organization itself provides the language training through a formal 'in-house' program taught by a permanent part-time or full-time staff").

(2) Outside-agency training ("the organization hires the services of an outside proprietary language teaching agency, such as Berlitz, Inlingua, etc. to conduct the training program").

(3) Outside academic training ("the organization has an arrangement with one or more colleges or universities to offer language training to employees").

(4) Individual private tutoring ("the organization reimburses the cost of individual private tutors (other than proprietary school tutors) for particular employees needing language training").

Second, it was felt that the survey of business organizations, though to be concentrated on the less commonly taught languages for purposes of the present report, would provide a useful opportunity to gather information concerning corporate training activities in the higher-volume languages as well. For this reason, the respondents were asked to list, and to answer the questionnaire in terms of, "the foreign languages (any modern language other than English) for which your organization provides language learning opportunities" through any of the four previously specified means.

The questionnaire was arranged in such a way that the respondent's first activity was to indicate whether or not the organization "makes foreign language learning opportunities available to members of your staff who will need to use languages other than English in their work either in the United States or abroad." For companies without any language training arrangements, the respondent was requested to so indicate and to return the questionnaire to the project office. Respondents whose companies did provide language training under one or more of the listed frameworks were asked to fill out series of additional questions for each type checked. For "outside agency training," the respondent was asked to: identify the particular agencies ("Berlitz, Inlingua, etc.") with which the organization contracts for such training; indicate whether the language teaching materials used are "regular textbooks or other materials [also used] with other clients (i.e., not specifically prepared for your company training program)" or, conversely, are "prepared especially for your company's training program, and concentrating on the specific kinds of language situations that employees in your company will be encountering in their work"; describe briefly the "tests or other means" used to determine student achievement in the contracted training program; and provide any other relevant information concerning the nature of the training program, the degree of satisfaction with the program, suggestions for improvement, etc.

For "outside academic training," the respondent was simply asked to "identify the colleges, universities, or other academic institutions which provide language training for your company" and to indicate the languages taught (with the expectation that the project staff would subsequently contact the institution directly for more detailed information on the program). For "individual private tutoring" (which was differentiated from proprietary school instruction), the respondent was asked to briefly describe how arrangements for such tutoring were made ("for example, each employee responsible for finding his or her own tutor, a list of qualified tutors kept by the company, company itself locates the tutors on request, etc."); to indicate the person(s) responsible for selecting the textbooks or other teaching materials to be used, ("the tutors themselves, the tutors following certain company guidelines, the company itself, etc."; and to describe the procedures used to measure student achievement in the program.

Somewhat more detailed information was sought concerning in-house language training programs. An indication of the general background of the instructors was requested, as either "current or former teachers of the language in an academic context [i.e., secondary school, college, or university language teachers]" or "speakers of the language who for the most part do not have prior experience in teaching the language (for example, regular company staff who are native speakers of, or highly proficient in, the language but who were originally hired for some other function)." With regard to course activities and instructional techniques, a combination of questions drawn from the two corresponding sections of the academic course report were reproduced (with slight editorial changes in some instances); these included such items as classroom contact with professional instructor/resource persons other than instructor, required or optional language laboratory attendance, use of commercially published and/or locally prepared audiotapes, use of other audiovisual equipment, and any student use of a computer in connection with study for the course.

With regard to needed instructional materials, the respondent was asked to identify the "greatest current need that you have with regard to suitable and effective instructional materials for the in-house language teaching program." Examples provided ("basic textbook, reference grammar, supplementary reading texts," etc.) were similar to those given in the corresponding question on the academic course report, with the addition of "exercises specifically related to business language." The respondent was also asked to describe the tests or other means through which student achievement in the program was determined.

A background question answered by all respondents (regardless of training program configuration) requested information on the particular types of employees eligible for foreign language training, including: those having or to be given "a duty assignment in a non-English speaking country"; employees in the United States "who will need to use a language other than English in connection with their U.S.-based jobs"; "employees based in the U.S. but having frequent travel commitments abroad"; and "employees who express an interest in learning a foreign language, whether or not their work is expected to involve foreign language use." A related background question asked for information concerning the "particular job positions that employees must hold in order to receive foreign language training (for example, only higher-level managers, only 'career' employees, only secretaries or other support staff in direct daily contact with speakers of the language, etc."). The third and final background question asked the respondent to indicate whether "explicit instruction in the culture and customs of the foreign country" is a formal part of the language training activities and, if so, how this instruction is incorporated in the training program.

Questionnaire Distribution and Response

On April 29, 1982, the final version of the questionnaire (Appendix D) was mailed to a total of 104 U.S. corporations drawn from the Fortune 500 list who were known or strongly presumed to have international business activities and interests. This mailing, addressed to the attention of the personnel training director at each organization, included a cover memorandum (Appendix H) requesting assistance in "a very important project in the field of foreign language education, and one that could have a direct positive influence on American business capabilities abroad." The business-survey portion of the project was described as attempting to determine "(1) the extent to which U.S. corporations doing business abroad currently provide foreign language training opportunities for their staff, and (2) what specific instructional materials and other types of support need to be developed to best serve business-related language teaching activities." A target response date of May 20 was specified, and it was further indicated that "if some other person or office would be in a better position to reply to the questionnaire, "the survey materials should be forwarded to the office or individual more directly concerned with the language training activities." As of mid-July, a total of only 17 returns had been received, and in an attempt to promote further responses, a back-up copy of the questionnaire, together with a second cover memorandum referencing the original mailing and again requesting assistance in the project, was distributed on August 5 to corporations on the original mailing list that had not responded as of that date. Following this reminder mailing, the responses increased over the next several weeks to a final total of 24, representing a percentage response rate of 23.1%.

Of the 24 returns, 5 respondents (21%) indicated that their company did not currently have any language learning arrangements for its staff. Of the remaining 19, the language programs of 11 (58%) consisted wholly of contracted outside agency (proprietary school) training. Only two organizations indicated that their language training program was entirely in-house, and the remaining 6 (32%) reported some combination of training procedures (see Table 11).

Languages reported as being taught (through any means) are shown below:

Arabic (6 mentions)
Chinese (3)
Czech (1)
Dutch (2)
Finnish (1)
Flemish (1)
French (14)
German (12)
Greek (1)
Japanese (8)
Norwegian (3)
Polish (2)
Portuguese (6)
Russian (3)
Spanish (14)
Swedish (1)

In addition, two companies reported instruction in "Scandanavian languages" and seven indicated that a variety of languages in addition to those listed were handled on demand.

The pervasiveness of proprietary school training among the business respondents is quite dramatically indicated by the fact that all but two (89%) cited such training as constituting at least one component of their language program.

Table 11

Language Training Procedures Reported by Corporate Respondents

(N=24)

No language training provided	21%

For corporations having some language training (N=19):

Proprietary school training only	58%
Proprietary school + individual tutoring	11%
Proprietary school + arrangements with higher education institution	5%
Proprietary school + tutoring + arrangements with higher education institution	11%
In-house training + proprietary school training	5%
In-house training only	11%

Corporations reporting any:

Proprietary school training	89%
Individual tutoring	21%
Arrangements with higher education institution	16%
In-house training	11%

Only 3 organizations (16%) reported having arrangements with colleges or universities to conduct language courses on their behalf, and only 2 (11%) reported in-house training by a permanent company staff.

With respect to the types of employees eligible for language training, those who "have or will be given a duty assignment in a non-English speaking country" were the most frequently noted (15 mentions out of 16 responding to this question). Language training for U.S.-based employees needing such ability in connection with their stateside jobs was less frequently indicated (8), as was training for employees based in the U.S. but required to travel abroad frequently. Language training opportunities for staff members "who express an interest in learning a foreign language, whether or not their work is expected to involve foreign language use" were provided by only 3 corporations, suggesting that relevance-to-business is an important precondition for staff participation in company-sponsored training programs.

Relatively few of the respondents report having guidelines or restrictions on "the particular job positions that employees must hold in order to receive foreign language training." Fourteen respondents marked "no" to this question, one indicated that the only requirement would be for the staff member to have a "business need connected to job," and two others cited guidelines related to particular job functions (e.g., "ground and in-flight service personnel"). Only one respondent indicated that language training was restricted to technical and managerial positions.

Some type of "explicit instruction in the culture and customs of the foreign country" was indicated by 8 respondents; write-in comments suggested that for the most part this training was provided by the contracted language teaching agency, for example ("intensive two-day cultural training session prior to departure administered by [proprietary school] for staff member and spouse").

A substantial majority of the respondents (14) indicated that language training was provided in both the U.S. and the foreign country. One respondent reported that more than half of the instruction was provided in the foreign country, and another indicated that the employees begin lessons in the U.S. and complete them abroad. Again in most instances, the domestic and foreign training is conducted by a proprietary school.

With regard to language teaching procedures, respondents who reported the use of proprietary schools, either alone or in conjunction with some other type of training program, indicated that, almost without exception, the textbooks or other materials used in the course were "[those] which the training agency also uses for their training programs with other clients," not specially prepared for the company's own program. Only two respondents indicated that the materials used by the training agency were "prepared especially for [the company's] training program" and based on "the specific kinds of language situations that employees in your company will be encountering in their work."

Procedures used in evaluating the learning outcomes of the proprietary instruction—as reflected in written comments to the question "Through what tests or other means is student achievement in the contracted training program determined?"—appear to consist, for the most part, of progress reports provided by the agency itself; typical comments in this regard were "feedback from professionals in these outside organizations," "progress reports from agency," and "whatever means the agency has. No follow-up inside the corporation." One respondent noted that "work performance" was evaluated (through unspecified means) and another, that "standard comprehension exams" (the languages taught including French, Spanish, Norwegian, and Arabic) were given, but without additional information. In no instance were company-developed (or company-monitored) evaluation arrangements referred to, nor was there any mention of the use of external direct tests of proficiency such as the FSI oral interview or similar performance-based assessment procedures.

For organizations reporting the use of private tutors (4 instances), determination of "what textbooks or other materials will be used by the tutors" is in all instances made by the individual tutors (with input from the student regarding learning needs in two cases). There are again no company-developed or monitored assessment procedures reported, with one respondent suggesting that tutor-based instruction is "not a matter of quantifying" and another indicating the the results of the tutoring are "not monitored very closely by company" due to its limited use.

The very limited number of organizations reporting outside language training under the auspices of a college or university department does not permit meaningful discussion of this training process, and it is also unfortunate that both the relative and absolute numbers of respondents indicating the existence of an in-house training program is insufficient to permit useful extrapolation (except for the apparent indication that the total number of such programs in the corporate population is quite low). As a matter of general information, one of the three respondents reporting an in-house program characterized it as being taught by both former teachers and native-speaker instructors, making use of materials prepared specifically for the company's training program, and involving language laboratory attendance, use of locally-prepared audiotapes, and motion pictures, with assessment via a company-prepared end-of-course examination. The second of the in-house programs was described as making use of regular academic (i.e., non-business-specific) teaching materials, group classroom contact with a professional instructor, and no use of audiovisual materials. The third program used both regular academic and company-prepared materials, made considerable use of audiovisual equipment, and relied on volunteer instructors drawn from among the company staff. Assessment procedures were not described for any of the three programs.

INSTRUCTIONAL ACTIVITIES AND MATERIALS UTILIZATION IN SELECTED GOVERNMENT LANGUAGE TRAINING PROGRAMS

As previously indicated, the primary emphasis of the survey was to investigate instructional materials needs as reflected in regular academic training programs in U.S. colleges and universities. However, in view of the fact that a substantial amount of training in the less commonly taught languages is carried out under the auspices of government agencies, it was considered desirable to obtain general descriptive information on the current language teaching situation at the most important of these agencies, as well as fairly detailed information on LCT instructional materials (1) actually in use, (2) in the course of development, and (3) considered to be needing development within these agencies.

With the interest and very ready cooperation of the U.S. Interagency Language Roundtable (ILR)--and under the general coordination of Dr. Peter A. Eddy of the ILR Materials Development and Research committee--ILR representatives from the Foreign Service Institute (FSI), Defense Language Institute (DLI), Central Intelligence Agency (CIA), and National Security Agency (NSA), agreed to arrange for the completion, at their individual agencies, of survey report forms for each LCT language taught in the agency. These report forms (see Appendix I for facsimile) were necessarily somewhat less detailed than the academic questionnaires, but were intended, by means of a write-in response format, to obtain language-specific information in the following areas:

(1) instructional objectives, operationally defined as "the major proficiency objective(s) toward which instruction in this language is directed (for example, real-time listening comprehension of radio broadcasts; speaking proficiency at a social interaction level; reading comprehension of technical material in a specified subject area, etc."

(2) instructional activities, defined as "the basic characteristics of the instructional program in this language (for example: classroom instruction; classroom instruction supplemented by conversation practice with native-speaker assistants; classroom instruction integrated with intensive language laboratory exercises; programmed self-instruction using print and audio materials; interactive computer-based instruction; language immersion programs; etc.)"

(3) Currently-used textbook ("title, edition, publisher, and date of publication of the primary text or text series that you use in teaching this language. If a regular text or text series is not used, please describe, instead, the materials that carry the major teaching burden in the program.").

(4) Supplementary materials ("In addition to the textbook or other basic instructional materials identified above, please describe any supplementary materials [e.g., reference grammars, additional reading texts, audiovisual materials, self-instructional exercises, etc.] that play a significant role in the instructional program.")

(5) Materials under development, requesting information on any textbook materials or other instructional media which "your agency is currently in the process of developing or contracting for...development."

(6) Needed materials (not counting materials under development), and defined as "the greatest current need that your agency has with regard to suitable and effective instructional materials for this language."

Relevant information supplied by each of the four training agencies is summarized below, based on questionnaire data supplied to the project as of mid-fall 1982.

Foreign Service Institute

The FSI offers full courses in some 41 LCT languages. Course objectives for speaking and reading comprehension are expressed in terms of the FSI "Absolute Proficiency Rating Scale," on which, for most languages, the full-time student of average ability is expected to attain Level 3 ("minimum professional proficiency") in both speaking and reading. The regular course varies from 20 weeks to 44 weeks depending on the language.

All courses are intensively taught, with formal sessions held from 4 to 6 hours per day. Throughout the training process, instruction is given in the basic structure of the language and development of oral proficiency, with the amount of time devoted to reading comprehension practice gradually increasing during the course. Beginning in 1981, some of the courses have incorporated two- or three-day exercises called "bridges," in which students engage in focused interaction emphasizing the use of language skills in professional contexts, such as inverviewing, briefing, debating, and negotiating.

FSI also offers Familiarization and Short-Term Training (FAST) courses in seven LCT languages. These courses last 6-10 weeks, and are intended to give the student an introduction to the language and culture of the country as well as a modest level of proficiency (generally, S-1/R-1). FAST texts are currently limited to specially prepared in-house materials.

For many of the FSI courses, the textbooks and other instructional materials are available to the general public, although in some instances, these materials are designated for in-house use only. Table 12 provides, for each language taught at FSI, a summary of materials used and their availability, as well as a brief description of materials under development and an indication of any other "needed materials" not currently being produced. Under "Basic Texts" the three sub-categories indicate (1) whether externally-prepared commercial (or FSI-prepared but publicly-available) texts are used in the course; (2) regardless of the situation with respect to (1), whether FSI-prepared but not publicly-available materials are used; and (3) the type and nature of any primary audiovisual materials used in the course (i.e., materials constituting an integral component of the course). Three similar columns are shown for supplementary materials used in the course, and the last two columns indicate any materials under development or considered to be needing development in that language. Within each cell of the table, a "yes" or "no" denotes that the respondent did indicate the availability or non-availability of the material in question but did not specify its exact nature. Where additional descriptive information is provided, this is briefly noted. Blank cells indicate "no response" for that particular category.

Table 12

Summary of FSI Course Materials

	BASIC TEXTS			SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIALS			MATERIALS UNDER DEVELOPMENT	MATERIALS NEEDED
	Commercial or Publicly Available	In-House	Audio-Visual	Commercial or Publicly Available	In-house (incl. newspapers, periodicals, etc.)	Audio-Visual		
Afrikaans	No	Yes	Audiotapes		Supplementary reading materials: intermediate & advanced	Radio, TV	No	
Amharic	No	Yes	Audiotapes	Yes	Supplementary reading materials: newspapers		Basic text; Audiotapes; Introduction to orthography	Basic text; L2-L1 Other dictionary
Arabic, Formal Spoken	No	Yes	Audiotapes	Yes	Yes	Radio	Basic text	Basic text; Ref. grammar
Written	Yes			Yes	Yes		No	
Arabic, Egyptian Written	Yes	No				Radio		
Bengali	No	Basic text; Introduction to writing		Basic text; Other: schoolbook series	Newspapers		Basic text; Introduction to writing	Basic text; Ref. grammar; L1-L2, L2-L1 dictionary
Bulgarian	Yes	Supplement. speaking material to basic text	Audiotapes	Yes				Basic text; Audiotapes
Burmese		Basic text						
Cambodian/Khmer	Yes		Audiotapes					Updated text
Cebuano	Yes				Supplementary reading materials: newspapers			
Chinese/Mandarin	Yes		Audiotapes		Other: diplomatic specific			No
Chinese/Cantonese	Yes		Audiotapes		Other: diplomatic specific			No
Chinese/Written	Yes		Audiotapes		Other: graded reading material			No
Czech	Yes	Yes	Audiotapes	Basic textbook; Ref. grammar; L2-L1 dictionary	Supplementary reading materials: newspapers	Radio, films		Basic spoken textbook

Summary of FSI Course Materials

	BASIC TEXTS			SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIALS			MATERIALS UNDER DEVELOPMENT	MATERIALS NEEDED
	Commercial or Publicly Available	In-House	Audio-Visual	Commercial or Publicly Available	In-house (incl. newspapers, periodicals, etc.)	Audio-Visual		
Danish	Yes			Yes	Newspapers, periodicals	Radio, TV		No
Dari		Yes			Other: newspapers, collection essays			L2-L1 dict.; Ref. grammar
Dutch	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Other: newspapers	Radio, TV		
Finnish		Yes	Audiotapes	Yes		Radio		
Greek,								
Katharevusa	Yes	Yes	Audiotapes	Yes	Newspapers	Radio, TV	No	No
Dhimotiki		Yes					Basic text	Basic text
Haitian Creole	Yes				Materials, newspapers			
Hebrew	Yes		Audiotapes	Yes	Newspapers	Audiotapes, radio, TV		
Hindi	Yes	No	Audiotapes	Yes	Newspapers	Radio		L1-L2, L2-L1 dictionary
Urdu	Yes	No	Audiotapes	Yes	Newspapers	Radio		L1-L2, L2-L1 dictionary
Hungarian	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Newspapers	Radio, TV		Updated basic text
Icelandic	Yes		Audiotapes	Yes				
Indonesian	Yes		Audiotapes	Yes	Newspapers	Radio, TV		
Japanese	Yes		Audiotapes	Yes		Audiotapes		
Korean	Yes	Yes	Audiotapes	Yes				Intermediate text
Lao	Yes		Audiotapes					L2-L1 dictionary
Malay	Yes		Audiotapes		Newspapers, supplementary reading materials and drills	TV		L2-L1 dictionary; Graded reader
Nepali	Yes		Audiotapes		Newspapers, written material			L2-L1 dictionary; Reading material

Table 12 (continued) -58-

Summary of FSI Course Materials

	BASIC TEXTS			SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIALS			MATERIALS UNDER DEVELOPMENT	MATERIALS NEEDED
	Commercial or Publicly Available	In-House	Audio-Visual	Commercial or Publicly Available	In-house (incl. newspapers, periodicals, etc.)	Audio-Visual		
Norwegian	Yes	Yes	Audiotapes	Yes		Audiotapes		
Polish	Yes	Yes	Audiotapes	Yes	Newspapers	Radio, TV, lectures	Basic text	Basic text; Grammar summary
Portuguese	Yes		Audiotapes		Newspapers, literature	Radio, TV		Audiotapes for listening comprehension
Romanian	Yes	Yes	Audiotapes			Radio, TV, sound/slide		Basic text (for intensive course)
Russian	Yes	Yes	Tapes, TV	Yes		Radio, TV, films	Basic text	Supplementary reading materials, intermed. and advanced; Supplementary speaking materials, intermed. and advanced
Serbo-Croatian	Yes	Yes			Newspapers, literature	Radio, TV, sound/slide, films (in English)		Updated basic text (for intensive course)
Sinhala (off campus)	Yes							
Swahili	No	Yes		Yes		Radio		
Swedish	Yes					Radio, TV		
Tagalog	Yes		Audiotapes	Yes	Newspapers, literature		No	
Tamil	Yes				Newspapers			L2-L1 dictionary
Thai	Yes		Audiotapes	Yes	Newspapers		No	No
Turkish	No	Yes	Audiotapes	Yes			Basic text	Graded reading materials
Vietnamese	Yes				Newspapers, periodicals	Radio		

Defense Language Institute

The Defense Language Institute Foreign Language Center (DLIFLC) responses show 40 LCT languages currently taught. These courses typically involve 47 weeks of full-time training. For the most part, proficiency levels expected on completion of the course are "3" in listening comprehension/speaking and "2" in reading and writing. A few courses are intended to achieve level 3 in reading. DLIFLC also offers a number of refresher courses, generally for students at the intermediate level.

Table 13 shows course materials information for UCT languages taught at DLIFLC. Virtually all the materials listed under "commercial or publicly available" have been developed by DLI. These include textbook material as well as supplementary readers and volumes on culture, economics, and literature of the target language country. For more detailed information on specific DLIFLC materials, the following publication should be consulted: Catalog of Instructional Materials, Defense Language Institute, Foreign Language Center. 1981. Presidio of Monterey, CA (DLIFLC Training Pamphlet 350-5).

Central Intelligence Agency

The Language School (LS) of the Central Intelligence Agency offers basic courses of the following types:

(1) Full-time beginning reading, speaking, and listening comprehension courses. These typically require 3-6 hours per day of contact with native speaker instructors, plus additional tape listening and individual work such as reading supplementary material. "Mini-immersion" experiences extending over two and a half days are part of these courses in most languages. Expected proficiency upon course completion is S-2/R-3.

(2) Part-time beginning reading, speaking, and listening comprehension courses. Students in these courses spend 3-5 hours weekly with instrucors, plus additional individual work. Expected end-of-training proficiency depends on student aptitude, difficulty of the language, and course length.

(3) Familiarization courses. These limited-scope courses may be full-time or part-time, and typically involve 30-45 hours of classroom time spread over a two- to ten-week period. Level 1 ("survival") proficiency is generally anticipated.

Table 14 below lists LCT languages presently taught at the Language School.

Table 13

Summary of DLI Course Materials

	BASIC TEXTS			SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIALS			MATERIALS UNDER DEVELOPMENT	MATERIALS NEEDED
	Commercial or Publicly Available	In-House	Audio-Visual	Commercial or Publicly Available	In-house (incl. newspapers, periodicals, etc.)	Audio-Visual		
Albanian	Yes		Audio-cassettes	Yes		No	Revision of portions of basic text	No
Arabic, Modern Standard	Yes		Audio-cassettes				Supplementary material to basic text	No
Egyptian	Yes	Yes					10 week basic text to follow MSA course. Revision	No
Syrian	Yes	Yes					10 week basic text to follow MSA course. Revision	No
Iraqi	Yes	Yes					10 week basic text to follow MSA course. Revision	No
Bulgarian	Yes		Audio-cassettes	Yes		Audio-cassettes	L2-L1 military glossary	No
Chinese, Mandarin	Yes		Audio-cassettes	Yes			Basic text	Material specific to DLI course objectives
Czech	Yes	Yes	Audio-cassettes	Yes	Yes	Audio-cassettes	Intermediate/advanced materials; Refresher/maintenance "package"	Audio-visual material of real life telecasts, scripts and exercises
Dutch	Yes		Audio-cassettes	Yes	Yes			
Greek	Yes		Audio-cassettes	Yes				
Hungarian	Yes		Audio-cassettes	Yes			Revision of major portions of basic text	

Table 13 (continued)

Summary of DLI Course Materials

	BASIC TEXTS			SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIALS			MATERIALS UNDER DEVELOPMENT	MATERIALS NEEDED
	Commercial or Publicly Available	In-House	Audio-Visual	Commercial or Publicly Available	In-house (incl. newspapers, periodicals, etc.)	Audio-Visual		
Indonesian	Yes		Audio-cassettes	Yes			Revision of latter portions of basic text	
Japanese	Yes		Audio-cassettes	Yes		Flash cards, films		
Korean	Yes		Audio-cassettes	Yes		Flash cards, audio-cassettes	Revision of basic text	(See Chinese)
Norwegian	Yes		Audio-cassettes	Yes	Newspapers, periodicals	Audiocassettes, films		
Pashto	No	Yes	Audio-cassettes	Yes	Newspapers			
Persian	Yes		Audio-cassettes	Yes		Audio-cassettes	Revision of portions of Threshhold materials	
Polish	Yes	Yes	Audio-cassettes	Yes			Intermediate/advanced materials; Refresher/maintenance "package"	Audio-visual material of real-life telecasts, scripts and exercises
Portuguese, Brazilian and European	Yes		Audio-cassettes	Yes		Audio-cassettes	Portion of basic text	
Romanian	Yes		Audio-cassettes	Yes	Newspapers			
Russian	Yes	Yes	Audio-cassettes	Yes		Audio-cassettes, cartoon guides	Intermediate/advanced revision; Refresher/maintenance "package"	
Serbo-Croatian	Yes		Audio-cassettes	Yes				
Swedish	Yes		Audio-cassettes	Yes		Audiotapes		

Table 13 (continued)

Summary of DLI Course Materials

	BASIC TEXTS			SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIALS			MATERIALS UNDER DEVELOPMENT	MATERIALS NEEDED
	Commercial or Publicly Available	In-House	Audio-Visual	Commercial or Publicly Available	In-house (incl. newspapers, periodicals, etc.)	Audio-Visual		
Tagalog	Yes		Audiotapes	Yes	Newspapers, magazines, periodicals			
Thai	Yes		Audio-cassettes	Yes				
Turkish	Yes		Audio-cassettes	Yes	Newspapers	Radio		
Vietnamese	Yes		Audio-cassettes	Yes	Yes	Videos, films	Revision of portions of basic text	

Table 14

Summary of CIA Course Materials

	BASIC TEXTS			SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIALS			MATERIALS UNDER DEVELOPMENT	MATERIALS NEEDED
	Commercial or Publicly Available	In-House	Audio-Visual	Commercial or Publicly Available	In-house (incl. newspapers, periodicals, etc.)	Audio-Visual		
Arabic, Levantine	Yes					Slides, videotapes	Yes	Basic text in Arabic script
Egyptian	Yes					Slides, videotapes		
Saudi	Yes					Slides, videotapes		
MSA (FSA)				Yes				
Chinese, Mandarin	Yes					Movies, videotapes	Proficiency test	Exercises to accompany videos
Danish	Yes		Audiotapes	Yes				Films; Reference grammar for American students
Dutch	Yes		Audiotapes	Yes		Radio course, audiotapes, radio, videos		Basic text for adults (not college oriented); Video material; Achievement test and scoring method for use in small classes
Greek	Yes		Audiotapes, videotapes	Yes	Newspapers, magazines	Videotapes		Basic text for reading only
Indonesian	Yes		Audiotapes	Yes			Intro. to grammar	Modern usage materials
Japanese	Yes		Audiotapes	No	Yes	Videos	Reading proficiency test	Exercises to accompany videotapes
Korean	Yes		Audiotapes	Yes		Videos	Basic short course	Exercises to accompany videotapes
Norwegian	Yes		Audiotapes	Yes	Picture dictionary, newspapers			

Summary of CIA Course Materials TABLE 14 cont'd

	BASIC TEXTS			SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIALS			MATERIALS UNDER DEVELOPMENT	MATERIALS NEEDED
	Commercial or Publicly Available	In-House	Audio-Visual	Commercial or Publicly Available	In-house (incl. newspapers, periodicals, etc.)	Audio-Visual		
Persian	Yes		Audiotapes	Yes	Newspapers	Audiotapes	Reading proficiency test	Videotapes
Polish	Yes		Audiotapes			Films, radio		Basic textbook with reading material; Basic textbook with simpler grammar explanation
Portuguese, Brazilian	Yes		Audiotapes	Yes		Audiotapes	Specialized topic glossary	L2 glossary of newspaper political terminology; Supplementary reading graded material; Cultural material
Russian	Yes			Yes	Dialogues, newspapers	Radio	No	No
Serbo-Croatian	Yes		Audiotapes	Yes	Newspapers		Specialized topic glossary; Picture dictionary	Access to newly published foreign basic materials; Updated materials
Swedish	Yes		Audiotapes	Yes	Newspapers, magazines		Audiotapes, slide/sound, videotapes, films	Basic short self-instructional text; L2-L1 dictionary of Swedish-American English idioms
Thai	Yes		Audiotapes	Yes	Yes	Videotapes	Exercise materials to accompany videotapes	High intermediate and advanced materials
Turkish		Yes		Yes	No	Audiotapes, videotapes	Exercise materials to accompany videotapes	Intermediate/advanced reader
Vietnamese	Yes		Audiotapes	No	Newspapers	Videotapes	Basic text	Exercise materials to accompany videotapes

National Security Agency, National Cryptologic School

NSA currently conducts language training in 9 LCT languages. The overall objectives of the NSA courses differ somewhat from those of the other three agencies, in that major emphasis is placed on listening comprehension and reading rather than on oral proficiency. Two to four different courses are typically offered in each language. The learning objectives are "to enable the student to develop competence in the following broad categories:

(1) to gist, outline, and answer questions in English on selected, unedited articles;

(2) discuss articles [in the target language];

(3) identify syntactic structures which are peculiar to [the target language], distinguishing between a 'free' translation and an incorrect one;

(4) choose the proper synonyms and word combinations in selected texts;

(5) transcribe stories, conversations, and [news] broadcasts."

Within these categories, individual courses have specified terminal objectives (e.g., transcribing in English from the target language, transcribing in the target language, answering questions in the target language, and translating specific texts).

Table 15 shows the instructional materials currently employed in LCT language courses at NSA, materials under development at the agency, and expressed additional materials needs.

As a convenience to the reader, bibliographic references for any basic textbook materials reported as being used in LCT courses at any of the four agencies, but not already listed in Appendix J by virtue of their use in a reported academic course, are included in the same Appendix, prefaced by an asterisk.

Table 15

Summary of NSA Course Materials

	BASIC TEXTS			SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIALS			MATERIALS UNDER DEVELOPMENT	MATERIALS NEEDED
	Commercial or Publicly Available	In-House	Audio-Visual	Commercial or Publicly Available	In-house (incl. newspapers, periodicals, etc.)	Audio-Visual		
Arabic,								
Modern Standard	Yes		Audiocassettes					
Transcription	Yes	Yes	Yes					
Advanced	Yes		Yes	Yes				
Chinese,								
Mandarin	Yes		Yes	Yes	Yes	Audiotapes	No	Videos in form of "soap opera"; Supplementary listening comprehension advanced materials
Written	Yes			Yes	Newspapers			
Newspaper	Yes			Yes	Newspapers	Radio		
Basic Reading	Yes	Yes		Yes	Newspaper, periodicals, magazines			
Classical	Yes			Yes				
Script writing	Yes			Yes				
Hebrew,								
Reading	No	Yes		Yes	Newspapers	Viewgraphs		No
Basic	Yes	Yes	Yes			Audiotapes, viewgraphs, videos	Videos (33 dialogue segments)	Videos of current Israeli TV programs
Korean,								
Reading	Yes	No		Yes	Selected topical articles	Visual aids		Supplementary reading intermediate material with notes
Basic	Yes		Audiotapes	Yes	Yes		Ref. grammar	Intermediate/advanced reading materials with exercises
Romanian	No	Yes		Yes	Newspapers, glossaries	Radio		

Table 15 (continued)

Summary of NSA Course Materials

	BASIC TEXTS			SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIALS			MATERIALS UNDER DEVELOPMENT	MATERIALS NEEDED
	Commercial or Publicly Available	In-House	Audio-Visual	Commercial or Publicly Available	In-house (incl. newspapers, periodicals, etc.)	Audio-Visual		
Russian (6 courses)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Quizzes/tests, dictation, grammar, supplementary texts, periodicals	Videos, radio, audiotapes	Cultural materials in Russian; Basic text in colloquial Russian	That depleted materials be replenished in timely manner; Taped natural spontaneous speech
Serbo-Croatian	Yes		Audiotapes		Quizzes/tests, selected articles	Audiotapes	Advanced materials; Audio lab exercises	L2-L1, L1-L2 dictionaries; Commercial basic texts;
Thai	Yes	Yes	Audiotapes	No	No	No	No	More basic text material
Turkish	Yes	No	Audiotapes		Newspapers, magazines			
Transcription		Yes	Audiotapes, radio, TV					
Colloquial	Yes		Audiotapes		Selected articles	Radio, TV, audiotapes		

SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The Survey of Material Development Needs in the Less Commonly Taught Languages was conducted in order to solicit information from a broad spectrum of specialists and teachers of LCT languages. The LCT Survey also solicited responses from the U.S. business community, as well as some of the U.S. government agencies which provide language training for their employees. The survey is intended to update and supplement the 1974 recommendations to the U.S. Department of Education, Division of International Programs to be used as guidelines by that office in determining priorities for funding for the development of materials for LCT languages.

The following recommendations are compiled from the responses to the questionnaires which have been discussed in the body of this report, as well as those submitted by specialists. They represent in many cases a consensus of informed judgments and are presented as such.

(1) The available survey data concerning the general configuration of LCT language courses suggest that these courses for the most part follow the traditional pattern of semester- or quarter-based study over the regular academic year, and are generally non-intensive (i.e., have 2 or fewer contact hours per day). In view of the considerable research literature indicating that intensive language learning experiences, especially of the "immersion" type, are highly effective in promoting both rapid and thorough language acquisition, it would seem desirable to provide this type of training in LCT languages on a wider basis than currently appears to be the case. Intensive language training may be considered an even more important consideration for those LCT languages whose structure is appreciably different from that of English or other Indo-European languages. Intensive programs of study abroad offer the additional advantage of constant exposure to culturally authentic language use situations, which can be duplicated only partially and with difficulty in U.S.-based training.

(2) To the extent that that the survey results may be considered representative of LCT language training programs generally, there are for all practical purposes no courses being offered that are explicitly designed to re-train students who have at one time reached a reasonably high level of proficiency but whose current competence in the language has declined through disuse. On the assumption that students who have already achieved some degree of competence in the language are more readily able to re-acquire these skills than initial learners--provided that suitably designed re-learning materials and other aids are made available to them--it would seem very desirable and ultimately highly cost-effective to develop the specific materials and procedures needed for this purpose.

(3) The survey responses indicate that only very few institutions offering instruction in LCT languages have a formal system for keeping track of program graduates. For the smaller-volume languages especially, having some established and ongoing means of maintaining contact with academically trained individuals in these languages would appear to be a relatively inexpensive yet potentially very important undertaking from the point of view of "human resource" quantifying and monitoring in these areas. Whether this type of recordkeeping would best be handled by the various programs on an individual basis or through some across-programs means is a question that should also be addressed in this connection.

(4) Questionnaire responses describing the nature and objectives of beginning- and intermediate-level LCT language courses suggest that, for the most part, these courses are being aimed at the development of functional language skills. Given this general orientation, the availability of teaching materials that provide effective practice in both listening comprehension and speaking in genuine communicative contexts (as well as reading comprehension of contemporary, "real-life" texts) would be of considerable importance. In this regard, after textbooks, the survey's two most frequently reported areas of "greatest need" for materials are for audiotapes and supplementary reading exercises. With respect to audiotapes, the quite high percentage of respondents who indicated that they were developing their own tapes--39% overall for beginning courses and 44% for intermediate courses--suggests the rather widespread unavailability (or unsatisfactory quality) of these materials from commercial or other external sources.

(5) Student progress in LCT language courses is, for the most part, being assessed through the very traditional means of classroom observation and instructor-prepared examinations. With the salient exception of the Japanese Proficiency Test, a professionally-developed and nationally normed test of listening comprehension and reading proficiency, there are no appropriate and readily-available external-to-program measures of developed functional proficiency currently available in the less commonly taught languages. (A similar test is under development in Chinese, to be available in 1984.) Although the need for externally prepared standardized tests was not strongly expressed at the individual-institution level, this did figure rather prominently in the review committee discussions and was explicitly identified in the individual reports of several committee members as an important "materials development" consideration.

(6) In addition to the need for generalized tests of functional proficiency independent of particular curricula is the need for achievement-oriented tests which can be used on a week-to-week or unit-by-unit basis to determine the student's acquisition of particular elements of course content in a detailed and highly diagnostic manner--both to chart progress during the course and to identify areas where additional instruction is needed. Textbook authors and publishers are in an ideal position to provide this type of testing as a basic component of the instructional lessons themselves. However, relatively few respondents note any use of "textbook tests" as part of their assessment procedures (10 percent at beginning and 5 percent at intermediate levels), most probably a reflection of the fact that a majority of textbooks for LCT languages (and for the higher-volume languages as well) pay little or no attention to testing matters. The most straightforward approach to resolving this situation would probably be to work directly with textbook authors to insure that appropriate testing exercises are included within the total instructional package; in this regard, materials development projects conducted under Department of Education auspices could be required to incorporate these aspects within the total scope of work. For situations in which the teaching package itself does not provide suitable assessment materials, it is necessary for the individual instructors to prepare such materials locally, with overall quality of these materials dependent in large part on the level of interest and measurement expertise of the persons involved.

(7) Although computer-assisted instruction does not, on a total percentage-of-use basis, currently figure prominently among the instructional resources

being called upon by LCT language teachers (by comparison to audiotapes, videotapes, and other more conventional media), there are fairly clear indications--both from the questionnaire responses of individual departments and from a growing number of related articles in the professional literature--that CAI is being increasingly viewed as a very powerful and effective ally in the instructional process. Notwithstanding the relatively small number of CAI programs in operation within the UCT language field at present, this situation may change radically in the fairly near future as a result of the synergistic interaction of a number of factors, including (a) constantly increasing availability of suitable hardware, both on an institutional and individual-student basis; (b) budgetary pressures to reduce instructional staff and/or increase student-instructor ratios; (c) increasing sophistication and ease-of-use of courseware authoring languages and programs; (d) clinical research and growing experimental data on the effectiveness of CAI in accomplishing specified teaching objectives, most notably initial training and drill in grammatical structures, vocabulary development, and reading comprehension practice with constantly available interpretation prompts.

Effective assistance in CAI development and dissemination within the near-term future would probably involve a number of different activities. One recommendation would be to provide for the timely dissemination of a variety of types of information concerning CAI applications in the language field, including reports of individuals and institutions involved in experimentation with or operational use of CAI programs; information about technical advances having special relevance to language instruction (for example, high-resolution CRT screens permitting very clear display of non-Roman alphabets, character-based languages, etc.); and detailed descriptions of available CAI language programs, with respect to both their language content/instructional objectives and technical requirements (equipment on which usable, etc.). Because of very rapid changes and progress within the computer/CAI fields generally, such a database should be designed to operate on a very short turnaround cycle (presumably computer-assisted in its own right), so that the available information would be current as of a matter of days.

A second type of substantive assistance to effective CAI development would be the commissioning of a small group of highly qualified individuals--collectively highly knowledgeable in second-language learning theory, computer applications, and programmed instruction, to develop a set of detailed guidelines for developers of CAI language programs. These guidelines would treat such aspects as: areas of language training in which computer assistance is most effective and appropriate (by comparison to instructional tasks best performed by a live instructor); outlines or frameworks for various types of instructional exercises that are both readily programmable and in keeping with effective learning principles; and technical and other resource information that would be needed by or helpful to prospective program authors.

A third possible area of support would be the providing of fellowships or other short-term financial support to carefully selected faculty members or other qualified resource persons in specified LCT languages for the express purpose of obtaining hands-on familiarization and training in computer-assisted instruction techniques, to be followed by the actual preparation of a specified instructional program in the designated language.

(8) Although textbooks were the priority materials need reported by a majority of respondents at both the beginning and intermediate levels, for individual languages, other types of materials are identified as the "greatest current need" in many instances. For example, for beginning level Russian, 11% of the respondents considered "cultural materials" to be the most important development need, and for Japanese, 16% considered videotapes and other audiovisual equipment as their primary current lack. One possible interpretation of these data is that, for languages already reasonably well equipped with respect to textbooks and other basic instructional materials, respondents are identifying significant "second-order" materials to supplement and reinforce the existing fundamental teaching tools.

(9) Since materials development recommendations made by the project review committee take into account both the results of the present survey and the extensive information base on which they are able to draw concerning languages in their own area of specialization, these recommendations are considered to warrant detailed consideration in connection with the setting of materials development priorities. However, it should be indicated that neither the design of the survey nor the consultative role of the review committee was intended to take into account the numerous non-language related factors including economic, strategic, and policy considerations that would be expected to affect the nature and extent of government and/or private sector support of materials development efforts in a given language or language area.

(10) Results of the survey of corporate language training, though based on a relatively low response rate, provide some extremely interesting provisional information concerning the extent and general nature of this training. The most salient finding is the major role played by proprietary schools, as reflected in the fact that almost 9 out of 10 of the responding organizations (89%) make at least some use of proprietary school training, with over half (58%) identifying this as their sole source of language instruction. In this regard, it is significant to note that the training materials used by the proprietary agencies are in virtually all instances "regular textbooks or other materials...also [used] with other clients." To the extent that business-related language learning needs can be considered to differ from academic or "general purpose" instruction (with respect to, for example, the particular language-use situations represented, the relative importance accorded to various types of lexicon, etc.), instructional materials and procedures that are more closely and more deliberately matched to "business language" needs would be recommended. Development of such materials would probably come about as a result of market factors, provided that the corporations themselves were adequately informed and insistent concerning the specific nature of the language training requested of the proprietary schools.

(11) Also related to the preceding is the fairly clear indication that the responding corporations are, for the most part, taking little or no active role in the monitoring and quality control of the language instruction provided by proprietary agencies or academic institutions conducting such training. Inasmuch as the functional goals of business language instruction can be rather readily specified (by comparison, for example, to academic language training for personal/cultural development or other generalized purposes), the assessment of developed proficiency in the language-use situations represented would be a relatively straightforward task for language testing specialists working cooperatively with a corporation or group of corporations to specify the

assessment approach and content involved and to develop the necessary instruments. Direct proficiency interviews of the FSI type might be considered as a basic framework for testing communicative proficiency in business-related conversations with native speakers. In employment settings where reading comprehension is at issue, textual materials typical of those encountered in these situations would serve as the linguistic corpus for test development.

(12) Responding corporations were found to make relatively little use of college or university language teaching facilities. The reasons for this are not clear, but might be anticipated to involve a combination of such factors as relative cost and administrative complexity of making such arrangements with academic institutions by comparison to contracted proprietary schools; reluctance on the part of the institutions to carry out business-related language training; or lack of corporate knowledge about the potential of college- or university-based language instruction for business applications. In any event, given the general decline in regular academic enrollments in many postsecondary institutions, it would appear to be to these institutions' advantage to consider collaborative language teaching projects with various business organizations. The somewhat different perspectives on the overall nature and goals of language instruction that would be at issue in these activities might also have a thought-provoking effect on the nature and focus of the institution's regular language programs as well.

(13) In addition to materials development within higher education institutions, systematic materials development activity is taking place in the U.S. government agency language schools. In recent years, many of these textbooks have become available to the public, but their availability is not widely known in many instances. It is suggested that some priority be given to a) developing a better system of making what is publicly available better known; and b) fostering coordinated efforts between the agency schools and academic programs to develop teaching modules that could be adapted to fit particular languages. Readers have a way of becoming dated rather quickly, and thus their development can be expensive with relatively little return for the investment, in many instances.

(14) Although most respondents did not list dictionaries as the most urgent need for beginning courses, the demand for them increases as courses at the intermediate and advanced level are offered. It is conceivable that the urgent need for text materials is more obvious, and the cost of developing dictionaries is so high that respondents were reluctant to list them as immediate, single priority needs. However, their development should not be ignored. For some of the major languages, such as Arabic, the need for L1-L2 contemporary dictionaries is obvious. It would be quite useful to solicit a careful compilation of a specific list of languages for which the development of student dictionaries would be a very worthwhile use of limited funds.

SELECTED REFERENCES

Center for Applied Linguistics. Material Development Needs in the Uncommonly-Taught Languages: Priorities for the Seventies. Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1975.

Gage, William W. Uncommonly Taught Languages. ERIC Clearinghouse for Linguistics, Special Report No. 4, Bulletin No. 17. Washington, D.C.: Center for Applied Linguistics, September 1970.

Lambert, Richard D., ed. "New Directions in International Education." The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, Vol. 449, May 1980. Philadelphia: American Academy of Political and Social Science.

Lambert, Richard D., et al. National Target for South Asia Specialists: A Report to the National Council on Foreign Languages and International Studies. New York: National Council on Foreign Language and International Studies, n.d.

Olsen, Solveig. "Foreign Language Departments and Computer-Assisted Instruction: A Survey." Modern Language Journal, Vol. 64, No. 3, Autumn 1980. Pp. 341-349.

Perkins, James A., ed. Strength Through Wisdom: A Critique of U.S. Capability. A Report to the President from the President's Commission on Foreign Language and International Studies. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, November 1979.

Petrov, Julia A. "Foreign Language and Area Studies Research Under the National Defense Education Act: Historical Background" In Center for Applied Linguistics, Material Development Needs in the Uncommonly-Taught Languages: Priorities for the Seventies. Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1975. Pp. 3-11.

Petrov, Julia A., comp. Foreign Language, Area, and Other International Studies: A Bibliography of Research and Instructional Materials Completed under the National Defense Education Act of 1958, Title VI, Section 602. List No. 9. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1980.

Thompson, Richard T. "Modern Foreign Language Teaching in the Uncommonly Taught Languages." In Lange, Dale L, ed. Britannica Review of Foreign Language Education, Vol. 3. Skokie, IL: National Textbook Co., 1970. Pp. 279-309.

Thompson, Richard T. Uncommonly Taught Languages: Another Perspective. ERIC Clearinghouse for Linguistics, Special Report No. 6, Bulletin No. 19. Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics, January 1971.

Twarog, Leon I. "A National Ten-Year Plan for Teaching and Training in the Less Commonly Taught Languages." In Brod, Richard I, ed., Language Study for the 1980s: Report of the MLA-ACLS Task Forces. New York: Modern Language Association of America, 1980, Pp. 38-77.

Wiley, David and David Dwyer, comps. African Language Instruction in the United States: Directions and Priorities for the 1980s. East Lansing, MI: African Studies Center, Michigan State University, June 1980.

Appendix A

Survey of Materials Development Needs in Less Commonly Taught Languages

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR DEPARTMENT CHAIRPERSONS

Instructions: Please answer each of the following questions by checking the appropriate options or writing in answers as indicated. All information provided will be analyzed and reported on a basis that will not identify individual respondents or institutions.

1. On the lines below, please list each course in an uncommonly taught language that is being taught in your department or administrative area during the current academic year (1981-82). (For purposes of the survey, uncommonly taught languages are all modern languages other than English, French, German, Italian, and Spanish.) For each course listed, in addition to language designation and course title, two other items of information are requested:

- Instructor Name. Please supply first and last name of instructor (this information is requested solely to verify later receipt of the course report forms from the individual instructors). Please include yourself as an instructor if appropriate.
- Enrollment. Please give the total number of students enrolled in the course in 1981-82.

(If the requested information is more readily available in another, already-prepared form, e.g., departmental file record, this may be appended instead.)

Language	Course Title	Instructor	Enrollment

(Please attach an additional page if needed.)

2. Do any of the less-commonly-taught (LCT) language teaching activities in your department involve any of the following? Please check "yes" or "no" for each item below.

( ) Yes ( ) No Intensive language courses (defined as 3 or more hours per day of instruction)

( ) Yes ( ) No Computer-assisted instruction

( ) Yes ( ) No Self-study (student learns the language "on his/her own," with teacher involvement limited to occasional assistance, checks on progress, etc.)

( ) Yes ( ) No Inter-term and/or summer study of the language at the institution

( ) Yes ( ) No Inter-term and/or summer study of the language in institution-administered programs abroad

( ) Yes ( ) No Full-year academic study abroad

Please describe briefly any "yes" activities (language or languages involved, level at which used, etc.).

3. Do you have a system for maintaining contact with LCT language students after they leave the program (beyond the usual institution-wide alumni lists)?

( ) Yes ( ) No If "yes," please describe this system briefly and the uses that have been made of it.

4. Does your department offer any LCT language courses explicitly designed for students who have previously studied the language but who have had some proficiency loss through disuse? ( ) Yes ( ) No. If "yes," please briefly describe these courses and the typical backgrounds of students taking them.

5. Across all of the LCT languages and courses taught in your department, what in your opinion are the greatest areas of current need with regard to suitable and effective instructional materials? Please identify the language(s) involved, the type of material needed (e.g., basic textbooks, reference grammars, supplementary reading texts, audiotapes, dictionaries, cultural materials, pronunciation guides, etc.) and indicate the particular characteristics that such material should have in order to be of greatest usefulness and value. (Attach a separate sheet if desired.)

6. Please use the lines below to expand on any previous information or to provide any further comments about the language teaching program in your department or materials needs that should be considered in the survey.

PLEASE TURN THE PAGE.

6. (cont.)

____

____

____

____

____

7. In addition to examining teaching practices and materials needs in regular academic settings, we are interested in contacting other types of institutions or organizations that carry out training in the less commonly taught languages. If you are aware of any missionary schools, government agencies, proprietary schools, business corporations, or other non-academic organizations that offer training in the language(s) taught in your department, please identify them below.

____

____

____

____

____

____

____

____

8. Name (for checking of returns only)______________________________________

Institution____

Please return this questionnaire, together with completed Course Report(s) for any LCT language courses that you have personally been teaching in the current academic year, to:

Less Commonly Taught Languages Survey, Center for Applied Linguistics
3520 Prospect Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20007

Copies of the "Memorandum for Instructors," "Questionnaire for Instructors," and sufficient Course Report forms to cover the courses listed in question 1 should be distributed to the instructors involved, who are asked to forward the completed materials directly to the project offices at the address above. Any needed additional copies of these materials may be xeroxed locally, or will be forwarded to you immediately on telephone request to (202) 298-9292.

Your cooperation in this project is very much appreciated.

Appendix B

Survey of Materials Development Needs in Less Commonly Taught Languages

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR INSTRUCTORS

Instructions: Please answer each of following questions before completing the Course Report form(s) for courses you have been currently teaching in a less commonly taught language. The answers to these questions will be used, on a group basis, to generally characterize the instructor population responding to the survey and to assist in the interpretation of survey results. This information will not be analyzed or reported in any way that would identify individual respondents or institutions.

1. Please give the uncommonly taught language(s) that you currently teach (1981-82):

____

2. For how many years (including 1981-82) have you been teaching the language(s)?

____

3. Is language teaching your sole professional activity, or is it combined with some other type of teaching or employment? (Check one.)

( ) Sole professional activity

( ) Combined with other type of teaching or employment (please describe):

____

4. Your age in years (please check one):

( ) 25 or under
( ) 26-30
( ) 31-35
( ) 36-40
( ) 41-45
( ) 46-50
( ) 51-55
( ) 56 or over

5. Highest academic degree obtained (check one):

( ) High school or equivalent
( ) B.A. or equivalent
( ) M.A. or equivalent
( ) PhD. or equivalent
( ) Other (please describe)____________________

6. In what general field and subject matter is your highest academic degree?

____

(OVER)

7. Please list any regional or national professional organizations (in the language field) of which you are a member:

____

____

8. Do you have a tenured (or "tenure track") position at the institution where you are now teaching?

( ) Yes

( ) No

9. Across all the less-commonly-taught-language courses that you teach, what do you consider the single most urgent need insofar as the development of instructional materials is concerned? Please identify the language, the type of material needed (e.g., basic textbook, reference grammar, supplementary reading texts, audiotapes, dictionaries, cultural materials, pronunciation guides, etc.). Please also give any relevant information concerning the particular characteristics that this material should have to be of maximum value and usefulness. (Attach a separate sheet if desired.)

____

____

____

____

____

____

____

____

____

10. Name (for checking of receipt only) ______________________________

Institution ______________________________________

Please return this questionnaire, together with the completed Course Report form(s) to:

Less Commonly Taught Languages Survey, Center for Applied Linguistics
3520 Prospect Street N.W., Washington, D.C. 20007

Thank you very much for your assistance!

Appendix C

COURSE REPORT

Instructions: Please complete a separate Course Report form for each course in a less commonly taught language that you have been teaching in the current (1981-82) school year.

1. TITLE OF COURSE. ______________________

2. LANGUAGE. (if not included in title) ______________________

3. TYPE OF COURSE. Please check one of the following and supply additional information if indicated.

( ) Beginning = introductory course intended for students having no prior study of or exposure to the language

( ) Intermediate = follow-on course for students who have acquired the rudiments of the language via the beginning course or equivalent outside study/exposure

( ) Advanced = "beyond-intermediate" course aimed at further increasing student skills in listening, speaking, reading, or writing the language (e.g., composition and conversation course)

( ) Literature = course that may involve some proficiency-oriented instruction but is primarily intended to develop student knowledge and appreciation of literary works in the language

( ) Special-Purpose = course intended to teach the language for a specific academic, business, or personal application (e.g., "Ching documents," "language for airline personnel," "language for travel abroad," etc.) Please give a brief description of this course on the lines below.

____

____

( ) Other = course that does not fit adequately into any of the preceding categories. Please give a brief description of this course on the lines below.

____

____

4. TOTAL CONTACT HOURS. Please give the total number of classroom contact hours for the entire course.

______ total contact hrs.

5. COURSE ACTIVITIES. Please give the number of hours per week devoted to each of the following course activities. If none, write "0".

______ Group classroom contact with instructor

______ Group classroom contact with native speakers or resource persons other than instructor

______ Individual tutorial or other formally scheduled one-to-one contact with instructor

______ Individual tutorial or other formally scheduled one-to-one contact with native speakers or resource persons other than instructor

______ Required language laboratory attendance

______ Optional language laboratory attendance (Please estimate average weekly use by a typical student.)

______ Other formally scheduled learning activities (please describe)

____

____

6. TEXTBOOK. Please give the title, edition, publisher, and date of publication of the primary textbook (if any) used in this course. If a basic textbook is not used, please write "none" and describe, instead, the materials that carry the major teaching burden in the course.

____

____

How would you rate the overall quality of the above as a teaching device in the specific context of your own course?

( ) Excellent ( ) Good ( ) Fair ( ) Poor. Please describe briefly those aspects of the text (or other materials) that result in this judgment.

____

____

____

7. SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIALS. In addition to the textbook or other basic instructional materials listed above, do students in your course use any published supplementary materials (e.g., reference grammars, additional reading texts, English/target-language or target-language/English dictionaries, pronunciation guides, etc.?

( ) Yes ( ) No. If "yes," please supply titles and publication information below. Overall quality ratings and brief comments about these materials would also be helpful.

Title, Publication Information	Excel.	Good	Fair	Poor
______________________________	( )	( )	( )	( )
Comments? ______________________________				
______________________________	( )	( )	( )	( )
Comments? ______________________________				
______________________________	( )	( )	( )	( )
Comments? ______________________________				

8. AUDIOTAPES. Of the following, please check all that apply.

( ) No audiotapes (including reel-to-reel or cassette tapes) are used in conjunction with this course.

( ) Audiotapes provided by the textbook publisher and designed to closely coordinate with the printed textbook are used in the course. Please identify title, publisher, etc. below.

____

( ) Audiotapes provided by a commercial publisher but not specifically coordinated with the textbook materials are used. Please identify title, publisher, etc. below.

____

( ) Locally-prepared audiotapes are used. Please describe briefly below.

____

9. OTHER AUDIOVISUAL MATERIALS. Please identify below any audiovisual materials or aids other than audiotapes that are used in the course on a regular basis, including videotapes, movies, slides/filmstrips, or other A-V materials. For each, please supply publication information and a brief description of their use in the course.

10. COMPUTER USE. Do students work with a computer in any way in connection with their study for this course?

( ) Yes ( ) No. If "yes," please describe.

11. INSTRUCTIONAL OBJECTIVES. Please indicate the relative importance of each of the following instructional objectives for the particular course being described. (Check one box for each item.)

Objective	Of Great Importance	Quite Important	Of Some Importance	Of Little or No Importance
Development of listening comprehension skill	( )	( )	( )	( )
Development of speaking skill	( )	( )	( )	( )
Development of orthographic skills	( )	( )	( )	( )
Development of reading proficiency	( )	( )	( )	( )
Development of general writing ability	( )	( )	( )	( )
Familiarity with and appreciation of important classical literary works in the language	( )	( )	( )	( )
Familiarity with and appreciation of contemporary literary works in the language	( )	( )	( )	( )
Knowledge of the civilization and formal culture of the target language country(ies)	( )	( )	( )	( )
Knowledge of the informal ("way-of-life") culture of the target language country(ies)	( )	( )	( )	( )
Other (describe)________________	( )	( )	( )	( )

12. ASSESSMENT PROCEDURES. What procedures are used to test student attainment of the course objectives? (Please check "yes" or "no" for each item below.)

Yes	No	
( )	( )	General observation of student performance during the course
( )	( )	Paper-and-pencil quizzes prepared by the instructor
( )	( )	End-of-term written examination prepared independently by the individual instructor
( )	( )	End-of-term written examination prepared on a department-wide basis (or by individual instructors following a specified department-wide model)
( )	( )	"Textbook tests" published as part of the textbook or textbook package

PLEASE TURN THE PAGE.

Yes	No	
( )	( )	Externally-prepared standardized test
( )	( )	A test of knowledge of and/or sensitivity to the customs and culture of the foreign language country
( )	( )	Face-to-face speaking proficiency interview such as the Foreign Service Institute (FSI)-type interview or other formalized conversation-based test
( )	( )	A speaking test in which the student records his or her responses on tape
( )	( )	A test of listening comprehension, in which the student must indicate comprehension of the target language as spoken by the instructor or given on a tape recording
( )	( )	Other testing procedure (please describe)________________________

13. NEEDED INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIALS. What is the greatest current need that you have with regard to suitable and effective instructional materials for this course? Please identify the type of material needed (e.g., basic textbook, reference grammar, supplementary reading texts, audiotapes, dictionaries, cultural materials, pronunciation guides, etc.) and indicate the specific characteristics that such material should have in order to be most useful to you. (Please append a supplementary page if needed.)

14. OTHER INFORMATION. Please use the lines below and/or a supplementary page to provide any further comments about this course that would help to describe its objectives, teaching techniques, assessment procedures, teaching materials or materials needs, or to give any other information relevant to the project.

YOUR LAST NAME__________________(for checking receipt of materials only)

Please return this and any other Course Report forms, together with the Questionnaire for Instructors form, to:

Less Commonly Taught Languages Survey, Center for Applied Linguistics, 3520 Prospect Street NW, Washington, D.C. 20007

Thank you very much for your assistance!

Appendix D

LANGUAGE QUESTIONNAIRE FOR BUSINESS CORPORATIONS

Instructions: We would very much appreciate your answers to the following questions concerning the way or ways in which your organization makes foreign language learning opportunities available to members of your staff who will need to use languages other than English in their work either in the United States or abroad.

If your organization does not currently have any foreign language learning arrangements for its staff, please check the box below and return the questionnaire to us at the address shown at the end of the questionnaire.

( ) This company does not currently have any language learning arrangements for its staff.

If another person or office would be in a better position to reply to the questionnaire, we would appreciate it if you would forward it, together with the explanatory cover memo, to the office/individual more directly concerned with the language training activities.

This questionnaire is divided into sections according to the type of language training involved, and you will need to respond only to those sections that apply to your organization. A description of these sections, and the question numbers included in each section, are shown below:

BACKGROUND QUESTIONS (Questions 1-5)—applicable regardless of type of language learning arrangements

( ) IN-HOUSE LANGUAGE TRAINING (Questions 6-10)—the organization itself provides the language training through a formal "in-house" program taught by a permanent part-time or full-time staff

( ) OUTSIDE-AGENCY TRAINING (Questions 11-14)—the organization hires the services of an outside proprietary language teaching agency, such as Berlitz, Inlingua, etc. to conduct the training program

( ) OUTSIDE ACADEMIC TRAINING (Question 15)—the organization has an arrangement with one or more colleges or universities to offer language training to employees

( ) INDIVIDUAL PRIVATE TUTORING (Questions 16-18)—the organization reimburses the cost of individual private tutors (other than proprietary school tutors) for particular employees needing language training

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION (Question 19)—applicable regardless of type of language learning arrangements

On the list above, please place a check mark opposite any section(s) that apply to your company and then answer the individual questions below for that section or sections, as well as the "Background Questions" and "Additional Information" question below.

BACKGROUND QUESTIONS (for all respondents)

1. What types of employees are eligible for foreign language training? (Check all that apply.)

( ) Employees who have or will be given a duty assignment in a non-English-speaking country

( ) Employees working in the United States who will need to use a language other than English in connection with their U.S.-based jobs

( ) Employees based in the U.S. but having frequent travel commitments abroad

( ) Employees who express an interest in learning a foreign language, whether or not their work is expected to involve foreign language use

Additional information or comments on this question? ______________________________

____

2. Are there any guidelines concerning the particular job positions that employees must hold in order to receive foreign language training (for example, only higher-level managers, only "career" employees, only secretaries or other support staff in direct daily contact with speakers of the language, etc.)?

( ) Yes ( ) No. If "yes," please describe these guidelines. ______________________________

____

3. Is explicit instruction in the culture and customs of the foreign country a formal part of the language training activities?

( ) Yes ( ) No. If "yes," how is this instruction incorporated into the training program?

____

4. Where are the language training activities carried out? (Check one.)

☐ Only in the United States

☐ Only in the foreign country(ies) involved

☐ In both the U.S. and the foreign country(ies)

Additional comments on this question? ______________________________

5. Please list the foreign languages (any modern language other than English) for which your organization provides language learning opportunities through any of the procedures checked above (in-house training, outside agency training, outside academic training, or individual private tutoring). In addition to the commonly taught languages such as French, German, Spanish, etc., we are especially interested in training in the less commonly taught foreign languages such as Japanese, Arabic, Urdu, etc., so please list any such languages that may apply, as well as the more commonly taught languages.

______	______	______	______
______	______	______	______
______	______	______	______

IN-HOUSE LANGUAGE TRAINING

6. Which of the following best describes the language instructors in the in-house training program? (Check one.)

☐ They are current or former teachers of the language in an academic context (i.e., secondary school, college, or university language teachers).

☐ They are speakers of the language who for the most part do not have prior experience in teaching the language (for example, regular company staff who are native speakers of, or highly proficient in, the language but who were originally hired for some other function).

Additional information on instructor background or qualifications? ______________________________

7. Which of the following best describes the language teaching materials used in the training program? (Check one.)

☐ They are wholly or primarily regular academic materials (i.e., textbooks, tapes, etc. published for secondary school or college use), not specifically for use in "business language" training.

☐ They are designed to teach the language for general business-related purposes (for example, "French for secretaries," "Arabic for sales personnel"), but are not designed specifically for your company.

☐ They are prepared specifically for your company's training program, and emphasize the particular kinds of language-use situations that your company's employees will be encountering in their work.

☐ They combine both regular academic materials with supplementary workbooks or other materials that apply specifically to the company's language needs.

Additional information concerning the teaching materials? ______________________________

8. Please check "yes" or "no" for each of the following. The in-house language training program includes:

Yes	No	
☐	☐	Group classroom contact with professional instructor.
☐	☐	Group classroom contact with native speakers or resource persons other than instructor.
☐	☐	Individual tutorial or other formally scheduled one-to-one contact with instructor.
☐	☐	Individual tutorial or other formally scheduled one-to-one contact with native speakers or resource persons other than instructor.

Yes	No	
☐	☐	Required language laboratory attendance.
☐	☐	Optional language laboratory attendance.
☐	☐	Commercially-published audiotapes closely coordinated with the printed training materials.
☐	☐	Commercially-published audiotapes not specifically coordinated with the printed training materials.
☐	☐	Locally-prepared audiotapes.
☐	☐	Videotapes.
☐	☐	Movies.
☐	☐	Slides/filmstrips.
☐	☐	Other audiovisual materials.
☐	☐	Student use of a computer in connection with study for the course.

For any "yes" answers, especially for the last six items ("locally prepared audiotapes" through "student use of a computer"), please provide any additional relevant information below.

9. What is the greatest current need that you have with regard to suitable and effective instructional materials for the in-house language teaching program? Please identify the type of material needed (e.g., basic textbook, reference grammar, supplementary reading texts, audiotapes, dictionaries, exercises specifically related to business language, cultural materials, pronunciation guides, etc.) and indicate the specific characteristics that such material should have in order to be most useful to you. (Please append a supplementary page if needed.)

10. Through what tests or other means is student achievement in the in-house training program determined?

OUTSIDE-AGENCY TRAINING

11. With which outside proprietary agency(ies) (Berlitz, Inlingua, etc.) do you contract for language training?

12. Which of the following best describes the language teaching materials used? (Check one.)

☐ They are regular textbooks or other materials which the training agency also uses for their training programs with other clients (i.e., not specifically prepared for your company training program).

☐ They are materials prepared especially for your company's training program, and concentrate on the specific kinds of language situations that employees in your company will be encountering in their work.

PLEASE TURN THE PAGE.

13. Through what tests or other means is student achievement in the contracted training program determined?

____

14. Other comments or information concerning the contracted language training program (how long used, on what basis selected, degree of satisfaction with program, suggestions for improvement, etc.).

____

____

OUTSIDE ACADEMIC TRAINING

15. Please identify the colleges, universities, or other academic institutions which provide language training for your company and indicate the language(s) taught.

Institution	Location	Language(s) Taught

INDIVIDUAL PRIVATE TUTORING (other than proprietary school instruction)

16. How are arrangements made for private language tutoring of employees (for example, each employee responsible for finding his or her own tutor, a list of qualified tutors kept by the company, company itself locates the tutors on request, etc.)?

____

17. Who determines what textbooks or other materials will be used by the tutors (for example, the tutors themselves, the tutors following certain company guidelines, the company itself, etc.)?

____

18. Through what tests or other means is student achievement in the tutorial program determined?

____

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION (for all respondents)

19. Please give below or on a separate sheet any other information about the language training activities of your company that are not adequately covered in the preceding questions.

____

____

____

____

(For checking of returns only:) Name ______________________ Organization ______________________

Please return to: Less Commonly Taught Languages Survey, Center for Applied Linguistics, 3520 Prospect Street N.W., Washington, D.C. 20007. (Tel. 202/298-9292) Thank you very much for your assistance!

Appendix E

Center for
Applied
Linguistics

April 1982

Memorandum for: Chairpersons of Departments or Administrative Heads in the Less Commonly Taught Languages

Subject: Request for Assistance in Survey of Teaching Materials Needs

Our purpose in writing you is to request your assistance in what we feel is a very important project for those concerned with the teaching of the less commonly taught languages in the United States. As you may be aware from other sources, the Center for Applied Lingustics (CAL) has recently been awarded funding through the Division of International Education of the U.S. Department of Education to conduct a survey of teaching materials needs in the less commonly taught (LCT) languages, which for purposes of the survey are defined as all current world languages other than English, French, German, Italian, and Spanish.

A major purpose of the survey is to determine the nature, availability, and extent of use of textbooks, reference grammars, audiovisual aids, and other instructional materials used in teaching less commonly taught languages in the United States. We will also attempt to identify and bring to attention the lack of, or shortcomings that may exist in, available teaching materials in a particular language. Results of the survey will be reported to the Department of Education, and the data provided may be expected to play a major role in the Department's programmatic planning over the next three to five years. Because of the potential importance of the survey to your language area, we hope that you will be willing to assist us in this effort.

Two types of data gathering activities are being carried out with respect to language programs at academic institutions (a separate survey is being conducted of business organizations engaged in language instruction). First, department chairpersons in colleges and universities at which less commonly taught languages are taught are being asked to provide certain basic items of information about the language programs at their institution (total number of courses taught, enrollments, etc.) and to give their perspectives on materials development needs across languages and courses taught. Second, individual instructors at the participating institutions are being asked to provide fairly detailed information about the specific courses they are teaching, with special attention to the nature of the course and its objectives, the instructional materials used and, importantly, their judgments about instructional materials that need to be developed for these courses. It is felt that, in addition to the types of information that can be fairly easily provided by the department chairpersons or administrative heads, the further input of the course instructors themselves will constitute a very important source of data for the project.

We hope very much that you will be willing to assist us in these efforts by (1) completing and returning to us the enclosed "Questionnaire for Department Chairpersons" and (2) distributing, to instructors who have been currently teaching (1981-82) one or more LCT language courses in your department, the explanatory materials and survey forms also included in this package, with the request that they complete these materials and return them directly to us at the project office.

(OVER)

The instructor-addressed materials include multiple copies of: a memorandum describing the project, a short "Questionnaire for Instructors," and a somewhat more detailed "Course Report" form which instructors are asked to complete for the specific courses they have been currently teaching (1981-92) in an LCT language. Although the latter may appear to be quite bit of "paper," our experience has been that each course report form can be completed within a few minutes, and that the separate forms are easier to work with than a combined questionnaire on which more than one course would need to be dealt with simultaneously.

Because of the variation in numbers of instructors and courses taught across institutions, we have had to to select a single standardized number of instructor-addressed forms to include with each institutional package, specifically, five each of the memorandum for instructors and instructor questionnaire forms and ten of the course report form. For the larger institutions at which this number may not be sufficient, we hope that it will be possible for additional copies to be xeroxed locally as needed. If this cannot be done, we will forward additional copies immediately on telephone request to (202) 298-9292.

The instructor-addressed materials are "stand-alone" in the sense that all relevant information is provided in the memorandum and on the forms themselves. However, if in distributing these materials you would be willing to provide a short cover note (or verbal message) in support of this data gathering effort, this would, we believe, be an important additional reinforcement of the value and significance of the survey.

For purposes of the survey, an "instructor" should be considered anyone having primary responsibility for teaching a class group. Native speakers who provide additional language practice or other "resource persons" beyond the regular teacher would not be considered "instructors" in this regard. As indicated in the memorandum for instructors, all project data will be tabulated and analyzed on a basis that will not identify individual respondents or institutions. However, respondent names and institutional affiliations are requested on the forms solely as a means of verifying receipt of the distributed materials.

The target date for return of the survey materials is May 15, 1982, and we hope that it will be possible for you and your departmental colleagues to work within this general time frame. If you have any questions concerning the project or if any other assistance is needed, please contact us directly at (202) 298-9292.

We would like to take this opportunity to thank you in advance for your attention to and support in this project, which will help to guide the course of materials development planning for the less commonly taught languages over the next several years. Thank you again for your consideration of our request.

John L. D. Clark

John L. D. Clark
Director
Foreign Language Education
Project Director

Dora E. Johnson

Dora E. Johnson
Director
Office of Communication and
Publications
Co-Project Director

Center for
Applied
Linguistics

April 1982

Memorandum for: Instructors Teaching Courses in Less Commonly Taught Languages in U.S. Colleges and Universities

Subject: Survey of Teaching Materials Needs

As you may be aware from other sources, the Center for Applied Linguistics (CAL) has recently been awarded funding through the Division of International Education of the U.S. Department of Education to conduct a survey of teaching materials needs in less commonly taught languages (defined for purposes of the survey as all current world languages other than English, French, German, Italian, and Spanish).

A major purpose of the survey is to determine the nature, availability, and extent of use of textbooks, reference grammars, audiovisual aids, and other instructional materials used in teaching less commonly taught languages in the United States and, by the same token, to bring attention to any major lack or shortcomings that may exist for teaching materials in a particular language. Results of the survey will be reported to the Department of Education, and the data provided may be expected to be a substantial component in the Department's programmatic planning over the near and mid-term future. Because of the importance of the survey to the uncommonly taught languages field, we hope that you will be willing and able to assist us in the data gathering process.

For academic institutions (a separate survey is being conducted of business organizations engaged in language instruction), two types of data gathering activities are being carried out. First, department chairpersons in colleges and universities at which less commonly taught languages are offered are being asked to provide a number of basic items of information about the language programs at their institution (total number of courses taught, enrollments, etc.) Second, and even more closely relevant to the fundamental goals of the project, individual instructors at the participating institutions are being asked to provide fairly detailed information about the specific courses that they are teaching, with special attention to the nature of the course and its objectives, the instructional materials used and, very importantly, their judgments about instructional materials that need to be developed within the context of these courses.

The department chairperson at your institution has agreed to participate in the study and, at our request, is circulating the relevant survey materials to you and other instructors within the department who are currently teaching one or more courses in the less commonly taught languages. We hope very much that you will be willing to assist us in this project by (1) answering the few background questions on the enclosed "Questionnaire for Instructors" and (2) completing a somewhat more detailed "Course Report" for the specific course(s) that you have been currently teaching (i.e., during the 1981-82 academic year) in a less commonly taught language.

(OVER)

3520 Prospect Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20007 (202) 298-9292 Cable: CENTAPLING Telex: 892773

Individual copies of the Course Report form have been provided for each separate course, as opposed to a single form on which all courses taught would be combined. Although this would appear to be quite a bit of "paper," our experience has been that each report can be completed in only a few minutes, and that the separate-form approach is much easier to work with than a combined questionnaire.

This memorandum, the Questionnaire for Instructors, and the individual Course Report forms may be xeroxed if additional copies are needed or if you would like to keep a record for your own files.

Your name and institutional identification are requested on the Questionnaire for Instructors (and last name on the Course Report form) simply as a check on the distribution and receipt of the questionnaire materials. All project data will be analyzed and reported on a group basis that will not identify either individual instructors or institutions.

The completed "Questionnaire for Instructors" and Course Report form(s) for courses that you have been currently teaching (1981-82) should be mailed directly to the project office at the address below:

Less Commonly Taught Languages Survey
Center for Applied Linguistics
3520 Prospect Street N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20007

Target date for return of the survey materials is May 15, 1982. However, if you are able to return the completed forms prior to this date, this would be very helpful.

We would like to take this opportunity to thank you in advance for your attention to and assistance in this important project, which will help to guide the course of materials development planning for the less commonly taught languages over the next several years. If you would like any additional information concerning the project or if any other assistance is needed, please contact us directly at (202) 298-9292. Thank you again for your consideration in this matter.

John L. D. Clark

John L. D. Clark
Director
Foreign Language Education
Project Director

Dora E. Johnson

Dora E. Johnson
Director
Office of Communication and
Publications
Co-Project Director

Enclosures:
Questionnaire for Instructors
Course Report Form(s)
Return mailing label

Appendix G

RESPONDING INSTITUTIONS AND LANGUAGES REPRESENTED

INSTITUTION	INSTR. QUEST.	COURSE REPORT
American Graduate School of International Management (0)		
Arabic	1	
American River College		
American University		
Russian	2	3
Amherst College		
Russian	1	2
Antioch College		
Arizona State University		
Japanese	2	2
Baylor University		
Japanese	1	3
Bellevue Community College (0)		
Arabic	1	
Beloit College		
Hebrew	1	1
Japanese	1	1
Boise State University		
Boston College		
Boston University		
Bambara		1
Catalan	1	1
Hausa		1
Lingala		1
Setswana		1
Shona		1
Swahili		2
Twi	1	1
Yoruba		2
Zulu		1
Brigham Young University, Hawaii Campus		
Chinese	1	2
Japanese	2	4
Tongan	1	1
Brigham Young University Utah Campus		
Japanese		2
Brown University		
Japanese	1	3
Russian	1	
Bryn Mawr		
Russian	2	5
California Institute of Integral Studies		
Chinese		3
California State University, Domingues Hills		
Japanese	1	1
California State University, Fresno (0)		
Portuguese	1	1
California State University, Fullerton		
Arabic	1	1
Greek		1
Hebrew	1	1
California State University, Long Beach		
Russian	1	3
California State University, Los Angeles		
Central Michigan University		
Russian	1	2
Chaminade University of Honolulu		
Japanese	1	2
Chestnut Hill College (0)		
Russian		1
City College of San Francisco		
Gaelic	1	
City University of New York, Baruch College		
City University of New York, Graduate Center		
Arabic	1	1
Dutch	1	1
Norwegian	1	1
Japanese	1	2
Clark College		
Japanese	1	1
Clarkson College of Technology		
Russian	1	4
Cleveland State University (0)		
Portuguese	1	1
College of San Mateo		
College of the Holy Cross		
Russian	1	1
Colorado School of Mines		
Russian	1	2
Colorado State University		
Columbia University (2)		
Finnish		1
Hebrew	1	2
Hungarian	1	2
Turkish	1	1
Cornell University		
Burmese	2	2
Cambodian	1	2
Japanese	1	4
Macedonian	1	1
Polish	1	1
Serbo-Croatian	1	1
Thai	1	2
Vietnamese	1	3
Corning Community College		
Greek	1	
Russian	1	
Dartmouth College		
Russian	1	1
De Anza College		
Hebrew		1
Mandarin	1	1
Depauw University (0)		
Russian	1	
Drew University		
Russian	1	5
Duke University (0)		
Arabic		2
Japanese		3
Earlham College		
Japanese	1	
Eden Theological Seminary (0)		
Arabic		1
Edinboro State College		
Emporia State University		
Russian	1	1
Fairleigh Dickinson University		
Russian	1	1
Ferrum College		
Florida Institute of Technology		
Russian		1
Fordham University		
Fullerton College		

FOOTNOTE: Number of Chairpersons responding = 1, unless noted in parentheses following name of institution.
0 = No Chairpersons responded.
2 or more = Responses from more than one department within the institution.
If only institution listed = Response received from Chairperson only. No instructor or course reports received.

INSTITUTION	INSTR. QUEST.	COURSE REPORT
Georgia Institute of Technology		
Russian	1	
Georgetown University		
Portuguese	4	6
Vietnamese		3
George Washington University		
Russian	2	2
Grace Bible College		
Hebrew	1	
Harvard University (2)		
Bulgarian		1
Chinese	5	10
Japanese	3	4
Korean	2	3
Manchu	1	1
Mongolian	1	1
Polish	1	2
Russian	3	3
Ukrainian	1	1
Vietnamese	1	1
Hollins College (0)		
Holyoke Community College		
Russian	1	1
Indiana University (2)		
Bambara	1	3
Chichewa		1
Chinese	1	1
Estonian	1	
Hausa	1	2
Hungarian	1	2
Japanese	3	3
Korean		1
Mongolian	1	
Russian	2	2
Serbo-Croatian	1	3
Shona	1	2
Swahili	1	1
Tatar	1	1
Tibetan	1	1
Turkish	2	3
Uzbek	1	1
Wes Kos		1
Yoruba	1	1
Zulu		1
Indiana University of Pennsylvania		
Iowa State University		
James Madison University (0)		
Russian	1	
John Carroll University		
Russian	1	4
Juniata College		
Russian	1	3
Kalamazoo College (0)		
Chinese	1	1
Finnish		1
Japanese		1
Kansas State University		
Hindi-Urdu	1	1
Kent State University (2)		
Russian	2	2
Kings College		
Russian	1	1
Kutztown State College		
Russian	2	1
Lehigh University (0)		
Hebrew	1	2
Linfield College (0)		
Japanese	1	1
Loras College (0)		
Chinese		1
Los Angeles City College		
Loyola University		
Russian	1	

INSTITUTION	INSTR. QUEST.	COURSE REPORT
Macalester College		
Chinese	1	1
Portuguese	1	1
Marymount College		
Mary Washington College		
Russian		4
Miami University of Ohio		
Chinese	1	4
Japanese	1	4
Michigan State University (2)		
Amharic	1	1
Arabic		1
Bambara		2
Chichewa	1	1
Fulfulde	1	2
Hausa		3
Portuguese		3
Shona	1	1
Swahili	1	2
Middlebury College (3)		
Japanese	5	5
Russian	2	4
Monterey Institute of International Studies		
Chinese	1	1
Japanese	1	7
Russian	1	1
Monterey Peninsula College (0)		
Japanese		1
Mount San Antonio College		
Chinese	2	
Mundelein College		
Chinese	1	1
Japanese	1	1
Murray State University		
Russian	1	1
Muskingum College		
Russian	2	1
Nebraska Wesleyan University		
Russian		1
New Mexico State University, University Park		
Portuguese	1	1
Russian	1	1
New York University		
Northern Arizona University		
Northern Illinois University		
Indonesian	1	4
Lao	1	2
Portuguese	1	1
Thai	1	3
North Seattle Community College		
Chinese	1	1
Northwestern University (0)		
Akan	1	1
Arabic	1	3
Hebrew	1	1
Japanese	2	2
Nyingma Institute		
Oberlin College (0)		
Chinese	1	1
Japanese		1
Occidental College		
Japanese	1	8
Russian		1
Ohio University		
Chinese	1	1
Indonesian	1	3
Ohio State University (3)		
Arabic	1	
Chinese	2	3
Japanese	2	3
Romanian	1	2
Russian	1	7
Slovenian		1

INSTITUTION	INSTR. QUEST.	COURSE REPORT
Oklahoma State University (0)		
Chinese		1
Japanese		1
Old Dominion University		
Russian		1
Pace University		
Pacific University (0)		
Portuguese		1
Pasadena City College		
Chinese	2	4
Japanese	3	6
Pennsylvania State University (0)		
Japanese	1	3
Pensacola Junior College		
Hebrew	1	1
Russian	1	1
Pomona College		
Chinese	1	3
Hebrew	1	3
Portland State University		
Arabic	1	3
Danish	3	3
Finnish	1	1
Hebrew	2	3
Hungarian	1	1
Japanese	1	2
Norwegian	2	2
Persian	1	3
Portuguese		2
Romanian	1	1
Russian	1	2
Serbo-Croatian	1	1
Swahili		1
Turkish	1	3
Presbyterian College		
Swedish		1
Princeton University		
Arabic	1	
Chinese	1	2
Hebrew	1	1
Japanese	1	3
Russian	1	2
Providence College (0)		
Russian		4
Purdue University, Fort Wayne (0)		
Dutch	1	1
Randolph-Macon Women's College		
Russian	1	3
Ripon College		
Japanese		1
Rio Hondo College		
Russian	1	1
Rollins College		
Portuguese	1	1
Russian	1	3
Rutgers University		
Chinese	1	1
Japanese	2	2
Serbo-Croatian	1	
Russian	2	1
Sacred Heart University		
Japanese	1	1
Lithuanian	1	1
Polish	1	2
Saddleback Community College		
Saint Anselm's College		
Russian	1	1
Saint Lawrence University		
Russian	1	3
Saint Louis Community College at Forest Park		
Saint Olaf College (0)		
Norwegian	3	8

INSTITUTION	INSTR. QUEST.	COURSE REPORT
Seminole Community College (0)		
Russian		1
School for International Training, Experiment in International Living		
Chinese	1	1
Gujarati		1
Portuguese	3	4
Smith College (0)		
Czech	1	1
Southwestern at Memphis		
Arabic	1	3
Chinese	1	
Stanford University (4)		
Cantonese	1	1
Chinese	6	9
Czech	1	1
Japanese	4	7
Norwegian	1	2
State University of New York Center at Albany		
Finnish	1	1
State University of New York Center at Binghamton		
Chinese	1	1
Dutch	1	1
Swedish	1	1
State University of New York College at Brockport		
Chinese	1	1
Hebrew	1	1
State University of New York College at Buffalo (0)		
Russian	1	1
State University of New York College at Cortland		
State University of New York College at Oneonta		
Hebrew	1	
Polish	1	
Russian	1	
State University of New York College at New Paltz		
Hebrew	1	2
Polish	1	
Russian	1	1
Yiddish	1	1
State University of New York Center at Stony Brook (0)		
Polish	1	1
Russian	1	2
Swarthmore College		
Russian	1	2
Syracuse University (2)		
Bulgarian		1
Polish	1	1
Russian	4	5
Ukrainian		1
Temple University		
Chinese	1	3
Texas Christian University		
Russian	1	2
Towson State University		
Chinese	1	1
Japanese	1	1
Trinity University (Texas)		
Japanese	1	2
United States Air Force Academy		
Arabic	1	5
Chinese	1	5
Japanese	1	5
Russian	4	10

INSTITUTION	INSTR. QUEST.	COURSE REPORT
United States Military Academy, West Point		
Arabic	3	3
Chinese	3	7
Portuguese	1	1
Russian	2	2
University of Alabama		
Chinese	1	3
Japanese	1	
Russian	1	1
University of Alaska, Fairbanks		
University of Arkansas at Fayetteville		
Greek	1	1
Portuguese	1	
Russian	1	6
University of Arkansas at Little Rock		
Portuguese	1	1
University of California, Berkeley (5)		
Bulgarian	2	1
Chinese	3	1
Czech	1	1
Japanese	1	1
Korean	1	
Norwegian	1	1
Pali		1
Romanian	1	1
Russian	3	8
Serbo-Croatian	2	3
Swedish	1	1
University of California, Los Angeles (4)		
Bambara		1
Chinese	3	8
Czech	1	1
Hausa	3	2
Japanese	2	10
Setswana	1	
Swahili	1	1
Yoruba	1	1
Zulu	2	1
University of California, Riverside		
Chinese	1	1
Japanese		1
Portuguese	1	
University of California, San Diego (DIRECTED STUDY)		
Russian	1	2
University of California, Santa Barbara (2)		
Chinese	2	2
Creole		1
Hebrew	1	1
Russian	2	2
University of Central Florida (0)		
Russian	1	1
University of Chicago (2)		
Arabic	1	2
Hindi	2	2
Oriya		1
Persian	2	2
Tamil	2	2
Turkish	1	1
Urdu	1	1
Uzbek	1	1
University of Cincinnati: Raymond Walters College		
Chinese	1	3
University of Colorado (Boulder)		
Russian	1	3
University of Delaware		
Greek	1	
Russian	1	
University of Florida		
University of Georgia		
Danish	1	
Dutch	1	
Russian	1	5
Swedish	1	
University of Guam		
University of Hawaii at Manoa		
Balinese	1	
Burmese	1	1
Cambodian	1	
Chamorro	1	
Ilokano	1	3
Japanese	2	4
Lao	1	1
Maori		1
Marquesian	1	
Portuguese	1	1
Russian		2
Samoan	1	5
Tagalog	1	1
Tahitian	1	1
Thai	1	3
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign		
Burmese	1	1
Polish	1	3
Russian	2	2
Serbo-Croatian	1	1
University of Iowa (2)		
Chinese	1	2
Japanese	1	2
Russian	2	2
University of Kansas (2)		
Chinese	1	2
Ipili	1	1
Japanese	3	3
Korean		1
University of Maryland, College Park		
Chinese	2	2
Japanese	1	4
University of Michigan (3)		
Chinese	3	4
Hindi		1
Hindi-Urdu	1	3
Japanese	4	4
Marathi	1	1
Persian	1	2
Tibetan	1	
Turkish		1
University of Minnesota, Duluth (2)		
Japanese	1	2
Russian	3	4
University of Minnesota, Minneapolis (0)		
Irish	1	1
University of Missouri, Columbia		
Greek		1
Japanese	1	2
Russian	2	5
University of Missouri, Rolla		
Russian	1	5
University of Nebraska, Lincoln		
Chinese	1	1
Czech	1	1
Japanese	1	1
Russian	1	5
University of Nevada, Las Vegas		
Chinese		2
University of New Mexico		

INSTITUTION	INSTR. QUEST.	COURSE REPORT
University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill		
Chinese	1	2
Japanese	1	1
Polish	1	1
Russian	1	1
University of North Carolina at Greensboro		
Russian		3
University of North Dakota		
University of Oregon		
Chinese	2	2
Japanese	2	3
University of the Pacific		
Japanese	2	4
University of Pennsylvania (2)		
Bengali	1	3
Gujarati	1	
Hindi	1	2
Hindi-Urdu		1
Japanese	1	2
Marathi	1	1
Polish	1	1
Russian	1	1
Turkish	1	2
Urdu	1	
University of Pittsburgh		
Polish	1	2
University of Puerto Rico, Aguadilla		
Portuguese	2	
University of Puerto Rico, Rio Piedras (0)		
Portuguese		2
University of Richmond		
University of Rochester (0)		
Japanese	1	1
University of South Carolina, Columbia		
Chinese	1	2
Greek	1	1
Japanese	1	1
Portuguese	1	2
University of South Florida		
Arabic	1	1
University of Tennessee at Martin		
Portuguese	1	1
Russian	1	1
University of Texas at Austin (2)		
Hebrew	1	1
Hindi	1	1
Kannada	1	
Malayalam	1	1
Persian	1	1
Russian	1	1
Tamil	1	
Telugu	1	1
Turkish		1
University of Texas at El Paso (2)		
Japanese	1	1
University of Virginia (2)		
Chinese		2
Persian	2	6
Russian	1	1
University of Washington (3)		
Arabic		1
Bulgarian	1	1
Chinese	1	2
Hindi	1	2
Polish	1	1
Romanian	1	2
Russian	4	6
Thai	1	3
University of Wisconsin, Madison (4)		
Bambara	1	
Czech	1	1
Hausa	1	2
Indonesian	1	3
Krio	1	1
Norwegian	1	1
Russian	1	1
Serbo-Croatian	1	1
Swahili	1	1
Tamil	1	1
Telugu	1	2
Thai	1	3
Urdu	1	2
University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee		
Armenian	1	1
Polish	1	2
Russian	1	1
Serbo-Croatian	1	1
University of Wisconsin, Stevens Point		
Virginia Commonwealth University		
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University		
Russian	2	6
Washington State University		
Chinese	1	1
Hindi		1
Japanese		1
Washington University		
Russian		3
Chinese	2	1
Japanese	2	3
Wayne State University		
Armenian	1	1
Wesleyan University		
Chinese	2	2
Japanese	2	5
Western Illinois University (0)		
Swahili	1	1
Western Michigan University		
Arabic	1	2
Korean	1	2
Latvian	2	8
West Virginia University		
Russian	1	2
Wichita State University		
Wilkes College		
Russian	1	1
Williams College		
Russian	2	4
Wittenberg University		
Chinese	1	6
Portuguese	1	2
Wright State University		
Yale University		
Chinese	4	8
Indonesian	1	1
Japanese	3	6

Appendix H

Center for
Applied
Linguistics

April 29, 1982

Memorandum for: Personnel Training Directors at Selected U.S. Corporations

Subject: Survey of Foreign Language Teaching Activities and Materials Needs

We would like to ask your help in what we feel is a very important project in the field of foreign language teaching, and one that could have a direct positive influence on American business capabilities abroad.

The Center for Applied Linguistics (CAL) has recently been awarded funding through the Division of International Education of the U.S. Department of Education to conduct a survey of teaching materials needs in the uncommonly taught languges, including, for example, Chinese, Arabic, and Japanese.

As one component of the survey, we are attempting to determine (1) the extent to which U.S. corporations doing business abroad currently provide foreign language training opportunities for their staff, and (2) what specific instructional materials or other types of support need to be developed to best serve business-related language teaching activities.

In order to obtain the maximum possible usefulness from the business organization survey, we are asking participating organizations to provide information concerning language-learning arrangements for their staff in any modern foreign language, including the more commonly taught languages (for example, French, German, and Spanish) as well as the less commonly taught languages such as those mentioned above.

Your organization is one of approximately 100 leading U.S. corporations that are being asked to participate in the survey, and we hope very much that you will be willing to take the few minutes required to answer the questions on the enclosed survey form.

If your organization does not currently have any foreign language teaching arrangements for its staff, we would request that you so indicate by marking the appropriate box in the "instructions" section and returning the questionnaire to us at the address shown below. If some other person or office would be in a better position to reply to the questionnaire, we would appreciate if if you would forward it, together with this memo, to the office/individual more directly concerned with the language training activities.

Results of the survey will be tabulated and reported, on a summary basis that will not identify the particular responses of any given organization, to the Department of Education for use in its programmatic planning, and the project report will also be made available to the responding organizations and other interested persons in the fall of 1982.

(OVER)

3520 Prospect Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20007 (202) 298-9292 Cable: CENTAPLING Telex: 892773

Target date for return of the survey materials is May 20, 1982. However, if you are able to return the completed questionnaire prior to this date, this would be very helpful.

We would like to take this opportunity to thank you in advance for your attention to and assistance in this important project, which will help to determine teaching materials needs and other programmatic aspects of foreign language instruction in both academic and business-related contexts over the course of the next several years. If you would like any additional information concerning the project or if any other assistance is needed, please contact us directly at (202) 298-9292. Thank you again for your consideration in this matter.

John L. D. Clark
John L. D. Clark
Director, Foreign Language
Education

Project Director

Dora E. Johnson
Dora E. Johnson
Director, Office of Communication
and Publications

Co-Project Director

Enclosure:
Language Questionnaire for
Business Corporations

Survey of Language Training Activities and Materials for Less Commonly Taught Languages

Appendix I REPORT FORM

Instructions: Please complete a separate report form for each less-commonly-taught language that is taught by your agency. ("Less commonly taught" languages are all current world languages other than English, French, German, Italian, and Spanish.) This form may be xeroxed if additional copies are needed.

1. LANGUAGE. Please give the language to which this report refers:

2. INSTRUCTIONAL OBJECTIVES. Please briefly describe the major proficiency objective(s) toward which instruction in this language is directed (for example: real-time listening comprehension of radio broadcasts; speaking proficiency at a social interaction level; reading comprehension of technical material in a specified subject area, etc.). If two or more distinctly different training programs are offered in this language (such that quite separate learning objectives are involved), please use a separate report form for each program. NOTE: if the requested information on instructional objectives is already available in a departmental brochure, course catalog, or other publication, this material may be appended instead.

2. **INSTRUCTIONAL ACTIVITIES.** Please describe the basic characteristics of the instructional program in this language (for example: classroom instruction; classroom instruction supplemented by conversation practice with native-speaker assistants; classroom instruction integrated with intensive language laboratory exercises; programmed self-instruction using print and audio materials; interactive computer-based instruction; language immersion program; etc.).

3. CURRENTLY-USED TEXTBOOK. Please give the title, edition, publisher, and date of publication of the primary text or text series that you use in teaching this language. If a regular text or text series is not used, please describe, instead, the materials that carry the major teaching burden in the program.

4. SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIALS. In addition to the textbook or other basic instructional materials identified above, please describe any supplementary materials (e.g., reference grammars, additional reading texts, audiovisual materials, self-instructional exercises, etc.) that play a significant role in the instructional program.

5. MATERIALS UNDER DEVELOPMENT. If your agency is currently in the process of developing or contracting for the development of new textbook materials or other instructional media for this language, please briefly describe these materials and give estimated date of availability.

6. NEEDED MATERIALS. Without regard to any information given in item 5 above, what do you consider the greatest current need that your agency has with regard to suitable and effective instructional materials for this language? Please identify the type of material needed and the specific characteristics that such material should have in order to be most useful to your agency's teaching program.

Name of person completing this form and telephone contact (only for additional information/clarification if necessary):

______________________________ Tel. (   ) ______________

Please return the completed form to ____________________ by no later than

__________. Thank you very much for your assistance!

Appendix J

TEXTBOOKS REPORTED AS CURRENTLY BEING USED, BY LANGUAGE

WESTERN EUROPEAN LANGUAGES/PIDGINS AND CREOLES

Text Code (Times Mentioned)

* = Text mentioned only in course reports from government institutions (CIA, DLI, FSI or NSA), not from other institutions.

Catalan (076)

01 (1) Anem-hi Tots. 1981. Ramon Cavaller. Spain.

Danish (029)

01 (1) Moderne Danske Noveller II. 1972. Tingene. Copenhagen.

02 (1) The Way to Danish. 1976. Norlev and Kofoed. Copenhagen: Munksgård. (First pub. 1959)

03 * Danish: Elementary Grammar and Reader. 2nd rev. ed. 1979. E. Bredsdorff. London: Cambridge University Press.

04 * Lær Dansk. 1977. Laursen, Budtz-Jørgensen, eds. Copenhagen: Gjellerup.

05 * Huset i Mellemgade. Copenhagen: Akademisk Forlag.

Dutch (032)

01 (1) Dutch. 1974. J.G. Wilmots. Belgium.

02 (1) Dutch Course I. 1980. F. Bulhof. Austin, TX: University of Texas at Austin.

03 (1) Introduction to Dutch. 1977. W.Z. Shetter. The Hague: M. Nijhoff. (First pub. 1974.)

04 * Speak Dutch: An Audio-Lingual Course. 1974. W. Lagerwey. Grand Rapids, MI: Calvin College and Amsterdam: Meulenhoff Educatief. (4th ed.) Workbook.

05 * FSI Dutch Reader. 1975. Weinstein & DeBoeck. Washington, DC: FSI.

Finnish (031)

01 (1) Suomea Suomeski. 1979. O. Nuutinen. Helsinki: Otava.

02 (2) Finnish For Foreigners. 1963. Aaltio. Helsinki: Otava. (Rev. 8th ed. 1973-75)

03 * Finnish Graded Reader. 1968. Bell & Koski. Washington, DC: FSI.

Haitian Creole

01 * Basic Course in Haitian Creole. 1970. Valdman. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.

Icelandic

01 * Icelandic in Easy Stages, I & II. pub. in Iceland.

02 * Icelandic: Readings, Grammar, Exercises. pub. in Iceland.

Irish (064)

01 (2) Learning Irish I. 1980. Dublin Institute for Advanced Study.

02 (1) An Duanaire I. Dolmen Press.

Norwegian (030)

01 (2) Spoken Norwegian. 1964. Haugen & Chapman. New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston. (Reprinted and available from Spoken Language Services, Ithaca, NY, 1976-77)

02 (3) Norsk for Utlendinger. 1979. Persson. Oslo: Gyldendal. (Reprint of 1966 ed.)

03 (1) Reading Norwegian. 1976. Haugen. Ithaca, NY: Spoken Language Services. (Reprint of 1940 ed.)

04 (2) Om Norsk Nordmenn og Norge. 1981. Stokker & Haddal. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press.

05 (1) Snakker du Norsk. Huenekilde & Arnestad. Oslo.

06 (2) Norsk. 1981. Stokker and Haddal. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press.

07 (1) Tverrsuitt I and II.

08 * Basic Norwegian Reader. 1966. Chapman, ed. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

09 * Norwegian Grammar. 1977. B. Berulfsen. Oslo: H. Aschehoug & Co.

10 * Teach Yourself Norwegian. 1967. Marm & Sommerfelt. London: St. Paul's House.

Portuguese (091)

01 (2) Português do Brazil: Língua e Cultura. Rev. ed. 1977. Chapira & Gil. Cabrilho Press. (First pub. Phila. 1971.)

02 (4) Modern Portuguese. 1971. F.P. Ellison and Gomez de Matos. New York: Knopf.

03 (6) Português Contemporâneo I & II. 1972-73. Abreu and Rameh. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.

04 (3) A Grammar of Spoken Brazilian Portuguese. 1974. E.W. Thomas. Nashville: Vanderbilt University Press.

05 (2) Crônicas Brasileiras: A Portuguese Reader. 1976. Hower & Preto-Rodas. Gainesville, FL: University of Florida, Center for Latin American Studies. (First pub. 1974)

06 (1) Licões de Português. 1962. Buenos Aires: Editorial Kapelusz.

07 (1) Vinte Contos Brasileiros. Anthony Castagnero.

08 (1) Português: Conversacão e Gramática. 1978. Magro and De Paula. Washington, DC: Brazilian American Cultural Institute. (First pub. 1970)

09 (2) Portuguese: An Audio-Lingual Course with Correlated Tapes. 1975. Neto & Salemo. Brattleboro, VT: The Experiment Press. (First pub. 1968)

10 * Portuguese Programmatic Course I & II. 1974-80. Ulsh. Washington, DC: FSI.

11 * Portuguese Basic Course: Vol. I-VIII. 1968-80. Monterey, CA: DLI.

Swedish (028)

01 (1) Svenssons. 1977. Kristiansen.

02 (1) Svenska-Svenska. 1977. Scriptor.

03 (1) Svenska för er. Part I & II. (Swedish For You) 1973. S. Higelin. Stockholm: Swedish Educational Broadcasting Co. (First pub. 1967-68)

04 * Läsebok för invandrare. M. Mathlein.

05 * Swedish Basic Course. 1954-55. Washington, DC: FSI (unpublished. Available from Spoken Language Services, Ithaca, NY)

06 * Svensk, Svenska Nybörjarbok I Svenska. 1972. Holm & Mathlein. Språkförlaget Skriptor.

07 * FLER Texter Till Svensk, Svenska. 1976. Holm & Mathlein. Språkförlaget Skriptor.

08 * Svensk, Svenska Fortsättningsbok. 1976. Holm & Mathlein. Språkförlaget Skriptor.

09 * Svenska. 1972. Bruzæus & Wallin. Kursverksamheter Vid Lunds Universitet.

10 * Mera Svenska. 1971. Bruzæus & Wallin. Kursverksamheter Vid Lunds Universitet.

11 * Ännu Mera Svenska. 1975. Bruzæus & Wallin. Kursverksamheter Vid Lunds Universitet.

12 * Enspråkiga Övningar I Svenska - del I-II. 1976-78. Holm & Lindgren/ Lindgren & Janssen. Språkförlaget Skriptor.

13 * Svenskt Uttal. 1977. Higelin, Ekroth et al. Sveriges Radio Förlag.

14 * Svenska för nybörjare. 1975. Enbrant. Stockholm: Swedish Institute.

Yiddish (104)

01 (1) College Yiddish. 1965. Weinrich. New York: YIVO Institute for Jewish Research.

RUSSIAN (006)

01 (1) *Basic Conversational Russian*. 1964. G.H. Fairbanks. New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston.

02 (26) *Introductory Russian Grammar*. 1972. Stilman, Stilman, & Harkins. New York: J. Wiley & Sons. (Reprinted 1974)

03 (8) *Russian:Stage One*. 1980. Betkhtina & Davidson. Moscow: Russian Language Publishing House. (Reprinted 1982)

04 (3) *New Voices: Contemporary Soviet Short Stories*. Ed. by K.E. Harper et al. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Inc.

05 (28) *Russkii iazyk dlia vsekh: Russian for Everybody*. 3rd ed. 1977. Kostomarov. Moscow: "Russian Language" Publishing House. (Reprinted 1980)

06 (15) *Making Progress in Russian: A Second Year Course*. 1973. Davis & Oprendek. New York: J. Wiley & Sons, Inc.

07 (3) *Russian Intermediate Reader*. 1976. Mihalchenko. Skokie, IL: National Textbook Company.

08 (1) *Practical Stylistics of Russian*. 1972. Rozental' & Telenkov. Moscow.

09 (2) *Simplified Russian Grammar*. 3rd ed. 1977. M. Fayer. Skokie, IL: National Textbook Co. (Originally published by Pitman Publ. Corp.)

10 (1) *Russian for The Scientist*. J & L Turkevich. New York: Van Nostrand.

11 (9) *Continuing With Russian*. 1968. C.S. Townsend. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co. (republished, 1981. Columbus, OH: Slavica)

12 (2) *Reading Modern Russian*. 1979. Levin & Haikalis. Columbus, OH: Slavica.

13 (7) *Essentials of Russian*. 1964. Gronicka & Bates-Yakobsen. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, Inc.

14 (11) *Russian for Americans*. 2nd ed. 1973. Ben T. Clark. New York: Harper & Row.

15 (2) *Reading & Translating Contemporary Russian*. 1963. Dewey & Mersereau. Belmont, CA: Pitman Publishing Co.

16 (1) "Sbornik tekstov i upriazhnenii po russkomu iazyku dlia uchashchikhsia inostrantsev srednikh spetsial'nykh uchebnykh zavedenii (Anthology of texts and exercises in the Russian language for foreign students in mid-level specialized academic institutions)." E.A. Blintsovskaia. Moscow: "Vysshaia shkola", 1972.

17 (6) *A Russian Course (I,II,III)*. 1981. Lipson. Columbus, OH: Slavica.

18 (1) *Heritage of Russian Verse*. 1976. S. Obolensky, ed. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.

19 (1) *Advanced Russian*. 1980. Nakhimovsky and Leed. Columbus, OH: Slavica.

20 (1) "Russkii iazyk v dialogakh (Russian language in dialogues)." 1976. A.N. Shchukin. Moscow: "Russkii iazyk".

21 (1) "Kapitanskaia dochka (The captain's daughter)." 1972. Alexander Pushkin. Moscow: "Narodnaia biblioteka".

22 (2) *Russian Short Stories*. 1962. J. Iwanik. Indianapolis, IN: D.C. Heath & Co.

23 (1) *Land of The Firebird*. 1980. S. Massie. New York: Simon & Schuster.

24 (1) *Viewpoints: A Listening & Conversation Course in Russian*. 1979. D. Jarvis. Provo, UT: Brigham Young University Press.

25 (3) *Modern Russian, 2 pts*. 1977. Dawson et al. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press. (Reprint of 1964 ed.)

26 (3) *Basic Russian (I)*. 1977. M. Fayer. Moscow: National Textbook Co.

27 (1) *Fundamentals of Russian*. 1967. H. Lunt. New York: Norton. (revised, 1982. Columbus, OH: Slavica)

28 (4) *Beginning Russian (I & II)*. 1981-82. Leed, Nakhimovsky & Nakhimovsky. Columbus, OH: Slavica.

29 (4) *Russian As We Speak It*. 1976. Khavronina. Moscow.

30 (1) *26 Lessons in Russian*. 19--. Bitekhtina. Moscow.

31 (1) *Speak & Learn Russian*. 19--. Danowitz.

32 (1) *Otts'i i Deti*. 1976. Moscow: "Sovetskii Pisatel'."

33 (1) *A.S. Pushkin*. (6 vol. ed.) 1969. Moscow: "Sovetskii Pisatel'."

34 (1) *Exercises in Russian Syntax, 2 vols.* 2nd ed. 1969. Belevitskaia, et al. New York: Gordon & Breach Science Pubs., Inc.

35 (2) *Russian on Your Own*.

36 (1) *Russian Composition and Conversation*. 1977. Buxton. Skokie, IL: National Textbook Company. (Originally published as *Russian Reading and Conversation* by Pitman Publ. Corp.)

37 (2) *Russian*. 2nd ed. Pulkina, Zakhava, & Nekrasova. Moscow: "Russkii Iazyk".

38 (1) *Scientific Russian Reader*. 1960. Gershevsky. Belmont, CA: Pitman Publ. Corp.

39 (2) *Russian Area Reader*. 1962. Vasys, et al. Moscow: National Textbook Co.

40 (1) *Russian Word-Formation*. 1975. C. Townsend. Columbus, OH: Slavica. (corr. & reprinted 1980)

41 (1) *Business Russian*. S. Kohls.

42 (1) *The Russian's World: Life & Language*. 1974. G. Gerhart. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Inc.

43 (1) *The Penguin Russian Course*. 1977. Fennell. New York: Penguin Books.

44 (1) *Russian Sounds and Intonation*. 1977. E.A. Bryzgumova. Moscow.

45 (1) *The Russian People*. 1974. V.T. Bill. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago.

46 * *Russian*. 1967. Wagner. Moscow.

47 * *Russian*. 1974. Potapova. Moscow.

48 * *Russian in Exercises*. S. Khavronina. Moscow.

49 * *Russian Language on TV*. Linguatronics. 10 episodes.

50 * *Short Russian Reference Grammar*. Pulkina.

51 * *Basic Russian Grammar Refresher*. 1982. Fort Meade, MD: National Cryptological School. (Formerly *Introductory Russian*)

52 * *Russian Language in Dialogues*. 1979. Moscow: Russian Language Publishing House.

53 * *We Read Russian*. 19--. Moscow: Foreign Languages Publishing House.

54 * *Practical Russian*. 19--. G. Bogatova. Moscow: Foreign Languages Publishing House.

55 * *Text and Workbook in Advanced Russian Grammar and Syntax*. 1st ed. 1981. Fort Meade, MD: National Cryptological School.

56 * *Particles in Colloquial Russian*. A.N. Vasilieva. Moscow: Progress.

OTHER EASTERN EUROPEAN LANGUAGES

Albanian (XXX)

01 * *Albanian Basic Course, Vol. I-X*. 1960-80. Monterey, CA: DLI. *Exercises in Grammar*. *Workbook for Exercises in Grammar*. *Glossary*.

Bulgarian (021)

01 (3) *Bulgarski Ezik*. 1964. Marinova, et al. Sofia: Narodna Prosveta. (O.P.)

02 (1) *A Bulgarian Textbook For Foreigners*. 2nd ed. 1981. St. Ghinina, et al. Sofia: Naouka i Izkoustvo. (First pub. 1965)

03 (1) *Beginning Bulgarian*. 1962. A. Lord. The Hague: Mouton & Co.

04 * *Bulgarian Basic Course, Vol. I-XIII*. 1958-66. Monterey, CA: DLI. *Vocabulary*. *Dictionary*. *Supplementary Material*.

Czech (013)

01 (1) *Czech Textbook For Beginners*. U. Stromsikova.

02 (1) *Textbook For Beginning Czech*. 1972. Kovtun and Micklesen. Seattle, WA: University of Washington. (NDEA)

03 (2) *Czech For English Speaking Students*. 1970. Confortiová. Prague: Statní pedagogické nakladatelství.

04 (1) *A Modern Czech Grammar*. 1960. Harkins. New York: King's Crown Press. (First pub. 1953)

05 * *Czech Basic Course, I-VII*. 1968-76 (some revisions). Monterey, CA: DLI.

Greek (008)

01 (1) *Ta Nea Ellinika gia Xenoglōssous*. 2nd ed. 1967. S. Mavroulia. Athens. The Author.

02 (1) *Demotic Greek*. 1978. Bien, Rassias, & Bien. Hanover, NH: University Press of New England. (3rd rev. ed. pub. 1972)

03 (1) *Modern Spoken Greek for English-Speaking Students*. 1964. A. Arpajolou. New York: Hadrian Press.

04 * *Greek Basic Course, Vol. I-XV*. 1962-69. Monterey, CA: DLI.

05 * *Greek Reader*. 1963. Monterey, CA: DLI.

06 * *Speak and Read Modern Greek*. 1964. Pimsleur. Pittsburgh, PA: American Institute for Research.

07 * *Greek Basic Course, Vol. I-III*. 1975-80. Obolensky & Sapountzis. Washington, DC: FSI.

Hungarian (015)

01 (2) Learn Hungarian. 1965. Banhidi, et al. Budapest: Tankonyukiado. (Also available through Collet's, London)

02 (1) Hungarian Basic Course. 1962-64. Koski and Mihalyfy. Washington, DC: FSI. (NDEA/FSI)

03 * Hungarian Basic Course, Vol. I-VII. 1968-80. Monterey, CA: DLI.

Latvian (020)

01 (1) Latviešu Valodas Gramatika. 1966. Endzelīns. Riga, Latvia: U. Baltina-Berzinq. ALA (First pub. 1951. German ed. 1938)

Polish (016)

01 (1) Introduction to the Polish Language. 3rd rev. ed. 1978. Birkenmeyer & Folejewski. New York: Kościuzko Foundation. (First pub. 1967)

02 (1) An Intermediate Polish Course for English Speakers. 1978. Grala & Przywarska. Warsaw: PWN

03 (1) An Elementary Polish Course for English Speakers. 1981. Grala & Przywarska. Warsaw: PNW

04 (2) First Year Polish. 1981. O. Swan. Columbus, OH: Slavica.

05 (1) A Beginners' Course in Polish. 1977. Bisko, et al. Warsaw: PWN. (First pub. in 1966)

06 (1) Communicating in Polish. (Basic Course Series) 1974. Penny & Malinowska. Washington, DC: FSI. (NDEA)

07 (2) Teach Yourself Polish. 1970. Corbridge-Patkaniowska. New York: McKay. (First pub. 1964)

08 (2) Beginning Polish. 1973. Schenker. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press. (First pub. 1966-67) (NDEA) (Reprinted and available from Spoken Language Services, Ithaca, NY, 1975)

09 (1) Second Year Polish. (Forthcoming) O. Swan. Columbus, OH: Slavica.

10 (1) Introduction to Polish. Stones.

11 (1) Materialy do lektoratu jezyk polskiego. 1965. M. Szymczak. Warsaw: Warsaw University Press.

12 (1) Polish Scholarly Prose. 1981. Rothstein & Rothstein. Columbus, OH: Slavica. (NDEA) (Reprint of Washington, DC 1975 ed.)

13 * Fifteen Modern Polish Short Stories: An Annotated Reader and Glossary. 1970. Schenker. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

14 * Polish Basic Course, Vol. I-XV. 1960-81 (some revisions). Monterey, CA: DLI.

Romanian (012)

01 (1) *Romanian*. (Teach Yourself Books) 1970. Stefănescu-Dragănești & Murrell. New York: McKay.

02 (3) *Modern Romanian: Limba Română*. 1971. Augerot & Popescu. Seattle, WA: University of Washington Press. (NDEA) (Also available from Ministerul invațamintului, Romania, 1978.)

03 (1) *A course in Contemporary Romanian*. 1981. B. Cazacu. Bucharest: Edit Didactica și Pedigogica.

04 * *Spoken Romanian*. 1976. Agard & Petrescu-Dimitriu. Ithaca, NY: Spoken Language Services.

05 * *Romanian Basic Course: Vol. I-VII; Vol. IX*. 1963-70. Monterey, CA: DLI.

Serbo-Croatian (014)

01 (2) *Teach Yourself Serbo-Croatian*. 1972. Javarek & Sudjič. New York: David McKay.

02 (1) *Serbo-Croatian Reading Passages*. 1968. S. Babič. Belgrade: Kolarčev narodni univerzitet.

03 (1) *Monumenta Serbocroatica: A Bilingual Anthology of Serbian & Croatian Texts from the 12th to the 19th Century*. 1979. T. Butler. Ann Arbor, MI: Michigan Slavic Publications, University of Michigan.

04 (1) *Elementary Serbo-Croatian*. C. Ward.

05 (3) *Introduction to The Croatian & Serbian Language*. 1972. Magner. State College, PA: Singidunum Press.

06 (1) *Priručna gramatika hrvatskoga knižnevnoj jézika*. 1979. Zagreb: Školiska knjiga.

07 (1) *Hrvatskosrpski: Audio-vizuelna globalno-strukturalna metoda*. 1966. Leskovar & Pranjič. Zagreb: Skoliska knjiga.

08 * *Serbo-Croat for Foreigners*. 1973. S. Babič. Belgrade: Kolarčev narodni univerzitet.

09 * *Beginning Course for Serbo-Croatian I*. 1973. Belgrade: Institute for Foreign Languages.

10 * *Serbo-Croatian II*. (Intermediate) 1972. Belgrade: Institute for Foreign Languages.

11 * *Serbo-Croatian Basic Course: Units 1-50*. Hodge & Jankovic. 1976-80. Washington, DC: FSI.

12 * *Serbo-Croatian Pronunciation Phase, Vol. I & II*. Rev. ed. 1980. Monterey, CA: DLI. *Homework Book*. 1980. *Language Laboratory Exercises*. 1980.

13 * Serbo-Croatian Basic Course, Vol. I-XIV. 1958-66. Monterey, CA: DLI. Glossary. 1968.

14 * Serbo-Croatian Basic Structure. 1982. Fort Meade, MD: National Cryptological School.

15 * Serbo-Croatian Reference Grammar. 1982. Fort Meade, MD: National Cryptological School.

16 * Advanced Serbo-Croatian Grammar and Syntax. 1982. Fort Meade, MD: National Cryptological School.

Slovene (130)

01 (1) Guide to the South Slavonic Languages (Slovenian Section). 1980. R.G.A. de Bray. Columbus, OH: Slavica.

Tatar (313)

01 (1) Tatar Manual. 2nd ed. 1968. N. Poppe. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University. (NDEA)

Ukrainian (017)

01 (1) Learn Ukrainian. 1975. Makorova, et al. Kiev: Ukraina Society. (First pub. 1970-72 as Speak Ukrainian with Us)

02 (1) Modern Ukrainian. 1980. A. Humesky. Edmonton & Toronto, Canada: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies.

ARABIC (037)

01 (1) *Arabic For Beginners; Writing & Reading*. Al-Khaledy. Portland, OR: Portland State University Press. (First pub. 1962, Portland State College)

02 (4) *Modern Standard Arabic, Intermediate Level*. 1972. P. Abboud, et al. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan. (NDEA)

03 (15) *Elementary Modern Standard Arabic*. 1975. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan. (First pub. 1968)

04 (1) *A Programmed Course in Modern Literary Arabic Phonology and Script*. McCarus & Rammuny. 1974. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan. (NDEA)

05 (2) *An Introduction to Modern Arabic*. 1957. Ziadeh & Winder. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

06 (1) *A Reader in Modern Literary Arabic*. 1964. Ziadeh. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

07 (1) *Saudi Arabic, Urban Hijazi Dialect*. 1980. Omar. Washington, DC: FSI. (NDEA)

08 (1) *Modern Standard Arabic: Basic Course, Vol. I-XVIII*. 1973. Monterey, CA: DLI.

09 * *Introduction to Egyptian Arabic*. 1974. E.T. Abdel-Massih. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan, Center for Near Eastern & North African Studies.

10 * *Modern Written Arabic*. *Vol. I-III*. 1978-80. Smith, Naja & Snow. Washington, DC: FSI.

11 * *Contemporary Arabic Reader, Vol. I: Newspaper Arabic*. 1963. McCarus & Yacoub. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan.

12 * *Arabic Basic Course*. 1966. Monterey, CA: DLI.

13 * *Egyptian Course*. Validation ed. 1982. Monterey, CA: DLI.

14 * *Syrian Course*. Validation ed. 1982. Monterey, CA: DLI.

15 * *Spoken Iraqi*. 1969. Monterey, CA: DLI.

16 * *Arabic Aural Comprehension Course, Vol. I-XX*. 1975-76. Monterey, CA: DLI.

17 * *Written Arabic: An Approach to the Basic Structure*. 1968. Beeston. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

18 * *The Arabic Language Today*. 1970. Beeston. London: Hutchinson & Co. Ltd.

19 * *Arabic Sound System: A Practical Guide*. Z.S. Soloman.

20 * *Comprehensive Study of Egyptian Arabic, Vol. I-IV*. E. Abdel-Masseh et al. 1976-79. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan, Center for Near Eastern & North African Studies.

OTHER MIDDLE EASTERN LANGUAGES

Armenian (103)

01 (2) Modern Armenian. 1974. H. Andonian. New York: Armenian General Benevolent Union.

02 (1) Armenian Made Easy. 1975. Z. Melkonian. Detroit, MI: Armenian General Benevolent Union.

03 (1) A Textbook of Modern Western Armenian. 1977. Bardakjian & Thomson. Delmar, NY: Caravan Books. (NDEA)

Dari

01 * Spoken Dari. Prelim. ed. 1980. A.H. Latify. Washington, DC: FSI.

Hebrew (010)

01 (1) Thousand Hebrew Words. 1975. Schachter & B. Shafer. Tel Aviv: Achiasef.

02 (1) A Textbook of Israeli Hebrew. 1976. H. Rosen. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press. (First pub. 1962)

03 (3) Ha-yesod: Fundamentals of Hebrew. Uveeler & Bronznick. New York: Feldheim. (First pub. Rutgers State University, 1972)

04 (2) Basic Hebrew. 1973. Feinstein. New York: Bloch.

05 (4) Lessons in Modern Hebrew I & II. 1977-78. E.A. Coffin. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press. (First pub. 1976)

06 (2) Israeli Hebrew for Speakers of English. 1978. P. Cole. Urbana, IL: Galil Pub. Co. (First pub. 1975, prov. ed.)

07 (2) B'yad Halashon I & II. 1967-69. Y. Reuven. St. Paul, MN: EMC.

08 * Habet Ushema. 1968. Cais & Enoch. Boston, MA: Heinle & Heinle Publishers, Inc. Student Workbook, 1971.

09 * Leket be-Itonot ("Newspaper Selections"). Pub. in Israel.

10 * Intensive Readings. 1982. Fort Meade, MD: National Cryptological School.

11 * Practical Hebrew. 1981. Fort Meade, MD: National Cryptological School. Skill Reinforcement Workbooks (4).

12 * Structured Hebrew. Rev. ed. 1982. Monterey, CA: DLI and Fort Meade, MD: National Cryptological School.

Pashto

01 * Pashto Basic Course: Module 1 (Sound and Script). 19—. Monterey, CA: DLI.

Persian (Farsi) (052)

01 (2) Modern Persian: Intermediate Level. 1979. Windfuhr, Beeman, Davis, Mahamedi, et al. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan. (NDEA)

02 (2) Modern Persian: Elementary Level. 1979. Windfuhr & Tehranisa. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan.

03 (1) The Fundamentals of Persian Reading and Writing. 1981. M. Hillmann. Austin, TX: Persepolis Enterprises.

04 (1) First Year Persian. 1977. Kazem Tehrani.

05 (1) Introductory Persian. 1980. Windfuhr. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan.

06 (1) Colloquial Persian. 1976. M. Hillman. Austin, TX: University of Texas.

07 * Persian for Today. 1978. L. Mansour. Falls Church, VA: Author.

08 * Persian Basic Course: Unit I-V. 1980. Monterey, CA: DLI.

09 * Persian Basic Course: Vol. I-IX. 1960-67. Monterey, CA: DLI.

Turkish (053)

01 (1) Turkish For Foreigners. 1969. Sebüktekin. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Publications and Distribution Service. (O.P.)

02 (1) Turkish: Teach Yourself Books. 1980. G.L. Lewis. New York: McKay. (First pub. 1953)

03 (1) Turkish Reader for Beginners. 1966. J. Németh. The Hague: Mouton.

04 (1) Osmanisch-Türkische Chrestomathie. 1965. R. Kreutel. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

05 (1) Turkish Folklore Reader. 1971. I. Basğöz. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University and The Hague: Mouton. (Available from Humanities Press, New York) (NDEA)

06 (2) Turkish Grammar. 1976. R. Underhill. Cambridge, MA and London: The MIT Press.

07 (2) Turkish Basic Course. 1966. L.B. Swift and S. Agrali. Washington, DC: FSI. (NDEA)

08 (1) Turkish Grammar. 1962. J. Németh. The Hague: Mouton.

09 * Turkish Basic Course, Vol. I-XIV. Rev. ed. 1978-81. Monterey, CA: DLI. (originally pub. 1965) Workbook (4 vols.) 1976.

10 * Principal Turkish Speech Patterns. 1963. Monterey, CA: DLI.

Uzbek (079)

01 (1) Introduction to Modern Literary Uzbek. 1980. Cirtautas. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz. (NDEA)

SOUTH ASIAN LANGUAGES

Bengali (105)

01 (1) An Advanced Course in Bengali. 1978. Bender and Riccardi. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania. (NDEA)

Hindi (039)

01 (2) First Year Hindi Course. 1980. H. Van Olphen. Austin, TX: University of Texas. (First pub. 1972)

02 (1) Contemporary Hindi Reader. 1978. R. Bartz. Australian National University Press.

03 (1) An Intensive Course in Hindi. Pattanayak et al. 1973. New Delhi: Oxford. [First pub. 1968]

04 (1) Hindi Structures. 1979. P. Hook. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan. (NDEA)

05 (2) Conversational Hindi-Urdu I. 1973. Gumperz and Rumery. Delhi: Radhakrishna Prakashan. (First pub. 1962-63, University of California, and Delhi, 1967)

06 (1) A Primer of Modern Standard Hindi. Shapiro. (xerox)

07 (1) The Student's Hindi-Urdu Reference Manual. 1971. F. Southworth. Tucson, AZ: University of Arizona Press.

08 * An Active Introduction to Hindi. Units 1-25. 1976. D. Sharma & J. Stone. Washington, DC: FSI.

09 * Introduction to Written Hindi. Stone. Washington, DC: FSI.

10 * A Basic Hindi Reader. 1969. R.M. Harris & R.N. Sharma. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Hindi-Urdu (See 05 and 07 under Hindi above.)

Malayalam (137)

01 (1) Malayalam: A University Course. 1980. University of Michigan.

02 (1) A Course in Colloquial Malayalam. 1967. R. Moag & R. Moag. Milwaukee, WI: University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee.

Marathi (071)

01 (2) Spoken Marathi. Rev. ed. 1968. N.B. Kavadi and F.C. Southworth. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press. (First pub. in 1964) (NDEA)

Nepali

01 * Basic Course in Spoken Nepali. 1974. T.B. Karki & C.K. Shreshta. Kathmandu: The Authors.

Sinhala

01 * Spoken Sinhalese. 1979. G.H. Fairbanks, J.W. Gair & M. DeSilva. Ithaca, NY: Spoken Language Services.

Tamil (072)

01 (2) A Basic Tamil Reader and Grammar. 1980. Paramesiram & Lindholm. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago, South Asia Language and Area Center.

02 * A Tamil Primer. 1970. G.L. Hart & K. Hart. Madison, WI: The Authors.

Telugu (089)

01 (1) A Basic Course in Modern Telugu. 1968. Krishnamurti & Sarma. Hyderabad, India: Author.

Tibetan (051)

01 (1) Modern Spoken Tibetan: Lhasa Dialect. 1978. Goldstein & Nornang. Kathmandu. (First pub. 1970, Seattle)

Urdu (080)

01 (1) Introductory Urdu. 1975. C.M. Naim et al. Chicago, IL: Committee on Southern Asian Studies, University of Chicago.

JAPANESE (042)

01 (28) Beginning Japanese. 1976. Jorden and Chaplin. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press. (First pub. 1962) (NDEA)

02 (9) Intensive Course In Japanese. 1980. M. Takahashi. Japanese Language Promotion Center. (First pub. 1970)

03 (32) Learn Japanese (I & II). 1979. Young and Nakajima. Honolulu, HI: University of Hawaii Press. (First pub. 1976)

04 (5) Modern Japanese for University Students. 1980. Tokyo: International Christian University.

05 (1) Let's Study Japanese. 1965. Maeda. Tuttle.

06 (2) "Tonari No Shibafu." Advanced Spoken Japanese for Americans. 1980. Sakuma & Motofuji. University of California. (Videotape). (NDEA)

07 (2) Reading Japanese. 1976. Jorden and Chaplin. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press. (NDEA)

08 (2) An Introduction to Modern Japanese. 1977. Japan Times.

09 (1) Basic Japanese for College Students. 1966. Niwa and Matsuda. University of Washington Press.

10 (1) Mastering the Japanese Language. 1981. BYU-HC

11 (21) Modern Japanese: A Basic Reader. 1973. Hibbett & Itasaka. Harvard University Press. (First pub. 1965) (NDEA)

12 (2) Japanese for Today. 1973. Osaka University of Foreign Studies.

13 (1) Intermediate Reader:Japanese History and Literature. 1982. BYU Press.

14 (1) Toward Better Japanese. 1980. Salt Lake City, UT: BYU Press.

15 (2) Modern Japanese: An Advanced Reader. 1974. Itasaka et al. Tokyo: Kodansha International.

16 (2) The Standard Japanese Reader. Naganuma.

17 (1) Colloquial Japanese. 1972. Rutland, VT: Tuttle.

18 (1) Basic Japanese. Towson State University Press.

19 (3) Foundations of The Japanese Language. 1978. Taishukan Publishing.

20 (1) Japanese: A Basic Course. 1970. Alfonso and Niimi. Tokyo: Sophia University. (First pub. 1960)

21 (1) The Japanese Writing System. 1975. Takayama Inc.

22 (1) The Structure of The Japanese Language. 1973. Kuno. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

23 (1) A Manual of Japanese Writing. 1979. Chaplin & Martin. Yale Univ. Press. (First pub. 1967) (NDEA)

24 (1) Advanced Japanese Conversation. 1977. Chaplin & Martin. Yale Univ. Press. (First pub. 1965, Chaplin and Nihonmatsu)

25 (2) Intensive Course in Japanese. 1970. Tokyo: Language Services Co. Ltd.

26 (1) Modern Written Japanese, Vol. I and II.

27 (1) First Lessons in Japanese. Nagamura.

28 (1) Intermediate Japanese Reader. Tokyo: Waseda University.

29 * Japanese for Beginners. 1976. Yoshida et al. Tokyo: Gakken.

30 * Nihongo No Hanasikata (How to Speak Japanese). 1978. Tokyo: Kokusai Gakuyukai Nihongo Gakko. Rensyuutyoo. 1973.

31 * Yomikata. 1977. Tokyo: Kokusai Gakuyukai Nihongo Gakko.

32 * Nihongo Tokuhon I & II. 1971-77. Tokyo: Kokusai Gakuyukai Nihongo Gakko. Rensyuu-tyoo (Practice Book). 1977.

33 * Kanji Renshucho Book I & II. 1977-78. Tokyo: Kokusai Gakuyukai Nihongo Gakko.

34 * Koto Renshucho (Oral Practice) Book I & II. 1974-76. Tokyo: Kokusai Gakuyukai Nihongo Gakko.

CHINESE (043)

01 (1) A First Course in Literary Chinese. Vol. I-III. 1968. Shadick and Chien. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press. (NDEA)

02 (2) Elementary Chinese (I & II). 1972. Peking: Commercial Press. (1977 reprinted by DLI)

03 (1) Hanyu Keben, Intermediate Chinese Textbook.1981. St. Louis: Washington University Press.

04 (20) Beginning Chinese. 1980. John DeFrancis. Yale University Press. (First pub. 1963-64)

05 (3) Twenty Lectures on Chinese Culture. 1967. Huang. Yale University Press. (NDEA)

06 (1) Say It In Chinese. 1980. Lay. Dover.

07 (4) Speak Mandarin. 1967. Fenn & Tewksbury. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press. (NDEA)

08 (3) Read Chinese. 1958-61. Wang & Chang. Yale University Press.

09 (1) A Primer of Newspaper Chinese. 1970. Chih. Yale University.

10 (9) Elementary Chinese Readers. 1980. Beijing: Foreign Language Press.

11 (3) Speak Chinese. 1948. Tewksberry. Yale Far Eastern Pubs.

12 (2) Intermediate Chinese. 1964. DeFrancis and Chia-yee. Yale University Press. (NDEA)

13 (3) Intermediate Reader in Modern Chinese. 3 vols. 1967. Mills. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

14 (4) Standard Chinese: A Modular Approach. 1979. Washington, DC: Inter-agency Language Roundtable. (NDEA)

15 (2) Read About China. 1958. Lee. Yale University.

16 (4) Modern Chinese Reader. 1963. Peking University. Peking.

17 (1) Selected Short Stories of Lu Xun. 1979. Chinese University Press.

18 (3) Character Text for Beginning Chinese. 1964. J. DeFrancis. Yale University Press.

19 (1) Readings in Contemporary Chinese Literature. (Vol. 2 & 3). 1964-68. Liu and Li. Yale University. (Also 1970.)

20 (1) 140 Lessons on Chinese Conversation. Taipei: Ch'eng Wen Pub.

21 (3) Modern Chinese: A Basic Course. 1971. Peking University. Dover Pub/Peking University. (A version of Modern Chinese Reader)

22 (1) Three Hundred Sentences of Chinese. 1980. Beijing Language Institute.

23 (3) Chinese Dialogues. Pinyin ed. 1966. F. Fany-yu Wang. Yale University, Far Eastern Publications.

24 (1) Literary Chinese By The Inductive Method. 1948-50. Creel et al. University of Chicago Press.

25 (3) Reading From The People's Daily. 1975. Hsu. Yale University.

26 (1) Family. 1972. Pa Chin. Garden City, NY: Doubleday.

27 (1) Written Standard Chinese III. 1982. Huang & Stimson. Faitashen Pub.

28 (3) Spoken Standard Chinese I. 1976. Huang & Stimson. Faitashen Pub. (Also Yale University)

29 (2) Chinese For Americans (I & II). 1975. Ching-yi Dougherty. U.C. Santa Cruz.

30 (1) Intermediate Chinese Reader. 1973. J. DeFrancis. Yale University Press. (First pub. 1967) (NDEA)

31 (2) Chinese For Advanced Beginners. 1980. Mok. New York: F. Ungar.

32 (1) Chinese For Travelers. Berlitz. Macmillan.

33 (2) Chinese Reader, I and II. 1972. Peking: Commercial Press.

34 * Progressive Exercises in Chinese Pronunciation. 1951. Hockett. New Haven, CT: Yale University.

35 * Advanced Conversational Chinese. 1965. Teng. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

36 * Chinese for Beginners. 1980. Mok and Jofen. New York: F. Ungar.

37 * Beginning Chinese Reader, Vols. I-V. 1977. DeFrancis. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

38 * Chinese Characters. 1975. Monterey, CA: DLI.

39 * Chinese Reader, Workbook, Vol. I and II. 1977. Monterey, CA: DLI.

40 * Modern Written Chinese: Strategies for Reading: Module 1. 1978. Monterey, CA: DLI.

41 * Mandarin Primer. 1966. Y.R. Chao. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

42 * Introduction to Literary Chinese. 1954. Brandt. New York, NY: Frederick Ungar Publishing Co.

CANTONESE

01 * FSI Cantonese Basic Course. Vols. I & II. 1970. Boyle and Delbridge. Washington, DC: GPO.

02 * Speak Cantonese. 1973. Huang and Kok. New Haven, CT: Yale University.

OTHER EAST ASIAN LANGUAGES

Korean (047)

01 (2) Korean I-II: An Intensive Course. 1975. Park & Pak. Seoul: Yonsei University Press. (First pub. 1961-65)

02 (1) Myongdo's Korean, I and II. 1968. Seoul: Myongde Institute.

03 (1) Elementary Written Korean. 1963. Wagner, E.W. and C. Kim. Cambridge: Harvard-Yenching Institute. (NDEA)

04 (1) Intermediate Korean: Advanced Leader. 1961. Wagner, E.W. Available in xerox form from Dept. of East Asian Languages and Civilizations, Harvard University. (NDEA)

05 * FSI Korean Basic Course I & II. 1973-80. Park, B. Nam. Washington, DC: FSI.

06 * Intermediate Korean Reader. 1960. Chang. New Haven, CT: Yale University.

07 * Korean Basic Course, Vol. I-X. Rev. ed. 1980. Monterey, CA: DLI.

08 * Reading in Korean. Vol. 4. 1972. Seoul: Yonsei University.

SOUTH-EAST ASIAN AND PACIFIC LANGUAGES

Burmese (041)

01 (2) Beginning Burmese. 1968. Cornyn, W.S. and D. Haigh Roof. New Haven: Yale University Press. (NDEA)

Cambodian (139)

01 (1) Intermediate Cambodian Reader. 1972. Huffman, Franklin E. New Haven: Yale University. (NDEA)

02 (1) Modern Spoken Cambodian. 1970. Huffman, Franklin E. New Haven: Yale University.

03 * Contemporary Cambodian (7 vols.). Ehrman et al. 1972-75. Washington, DC: GPO.

Cebuano

01 * Beginning Cebuano. Vols. I & II. 1966. J. Wolff. New Haven, CT: Yale University.

02 * Cebuano Para Sa Mga Peace Corps Volunteers. 1967. B. Baura et al. Washington, DC: Peace Corps.

Ilokano (192)

01 (1) Let's Speak Ilokano. University of Hawaii. In press.

Indonesian (048)

01 (6) Beginning Indonesian I & II. 1977-79. J.U. Wolff. Cornell University Press. (NDEA)

02 (2) Indonesian Readings. 1977. J.U. Wolff. Cornell University Press. (NDEA)

03 (1) Vocabulary Building in Indonesian: An Advanced Reader. (Pre-publication) Soenjono Dardjowidjojo. Columbus: Ohio State University.

04 * Learn Indonesian Book 1, 2 & 3. McGarry & Sumaryono.

05 * Indonesian Conversations. 1977. J. Wolff. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University.

06 * *A Modern Reader in Bahasa Indonesian*. Sarumpaet & Hendrata. 1973-74. Victoria, Australia: The Authors.

07 * *Indonesian Basic Course: Sounds of Indonesian Speech*. Rev. ed. 1981. Monterey, CA: DLI.

08 * *Indonesian Basic Course. Vol. I-XIV*. 1971-73. Reprinted/revised 1974-81. Monterey, CA: DLI.

Lao (222)

01 (1) *Spoken Lao Course*. (Unpublished) A. Chrisfield.

02 * *Lao Basic Course, I & II*. 2nd ed. 1974. W. Yates, S. Sayasithsena & M. Svengsouk. Washington, DC: FSI.

03 * *Reading Lao: A Programmed Introduction*. 1974. W. Yates. Washington, DC: FSI.

Maori (256)

01 (1) *Te Rangatahi*. 1974. Wellington: Govt. Printer.

Samoan (172)

01 (4) *Samoan Language*. 1976. J. Mayer.

02 (1) *Samoan Dictionary*. 1966. Milner. Oxford Univ. Press.

Tagalog (087)

01 (1) *Tagalog For Beginners* (PALI Language Text). 1978. Ramos & De Guzman. University Press of Hawaii.

02 * *Beginning Tagolog*. (*A Course for English Speakers*) Ed. by J.D. Bowen. Berkeley, Los Angeles & London: University of California Press.

03 * *Intermediate Readings in Tagalog*. 1968. Ed. by J.D. Bowen. Berkeley, CA: University of California.

Thai (045)

01 (2) *AUA Book III*. 1969. M. Brown. Bangkok: AUA.

02 (7) *AUA Books I & II*. 1968. M. Brown. Bangkok: AUA.

03 (2) Thai Basic Reader. 1977. Gething & Bilmes. Honolulu, HI: University of Hawaii, S.E.A. Studies.

04 (1) Thai Cultural Reader. Book I (1968), Book II (1969). R.B. Jones, R.C. Mendiones & C.J. Reynolds. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press. (NDEA)

05 * Thai Basic Course. Vol. 1-4. Yates & Tryon. Washington, DC: GPO. (spoken)

06 * Thai Basic Course, Vol. I-XV. 1965-69. Monterey, CA: DLI. Glossary. 1980.

07 * Sounds of Thai Speech. 1966. Monterey, CA: DLI.

Tongan (106)

01 (1) Intensive Course in Tongan. 1973. E. Shumway. University of Hawaii Press.

Vietnamese (046)

01 (1) Intermediate Spoken Vietnamese. 1980. F.E. Huffman & Hai. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

02 (1) A Vietnamese Reader. 1961. L.C. Thompson and Nguyen Duc Hiep. Seattle, WA: University of Washington. (NDEA)

03 (1) Intermediate Vietnamese, Vol. I and II. 1971. Liem, Nguyen Dang. South Orange: Seton Hall University Press. (NDEA)

04 (1) Vietnamese Basic Course I and II. 1967. E. Jorden et al. Washington, DC: FSI.

05 (1) Vietnamese Pronunciation. 1970. Liem, Nguyen Dang. Honolulu: University of Hawaii.

06 * Vietnamese Basic Course Vol. I-VII. 1972. Monterey, CA: DLI. Workbook No. 1 & 2. 1974. Glossary. 1974. Grammar & Cultural Notes. 1974.

07 * Intermediate Colloquial Vietnamese. Thuy.

08 * Read Vietnamese: A Graded Course in Written Vietnamese. 1966. Hoa. Rutland, UT: Tuttle.

SUB-SAHARAN AFRICAN LANGUAGES

Akan (284)

01 (1) An Introduction to Akan. 1975. J. Berry & A. Akosua. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University.

Bambara (098)

01 (5) An Ka Bamanankan: Beginning Bambara. 1977. C. Bird et al. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Linguistics Club.

02 (1) An Ka Bamanankan Kalan: Intermediate Bambara. C. Bird. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Linguistics Club.

Chichewa (511)

01 (1) Chichewa. 1981. C. Scotton. Lansing, MI. Michigan State University.

02 (1) Learning Chichewa, Book 1 & 2. (A Peace Corps Language Course) 1981. G.J. Orr & C.M. Scotton. East Lansing, MI: Michigan State University, African Studies Center.

Hausa (077)

01 (4) Introductory Hausa. Kraft and Kraft. 1975. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press. (First pub. 1973)

02 (3) Spoken Hausa. 1976. J R. Cowan & R.G. Schuh. Ithaca, NY: Spoken Language Services.

03 (1) Manual of Hausa Idioms. 1976. D.M. Bagari, W.R. Leben & F.M. Knox. Stanford: Stanford University. (NDEA)

04) 1) Hausa Newspaper Readings. 1967. C. Hodge. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University.

Setswana (508)

01 (1) Setswana: Grammar Handbook. 1979. D. Hopkins. Brattleboro, VT: Pro Lingua Association.

Shona (163)

01 (1) Shona Companion. 1974. Dale. Gwelo, Zimbabwe: Mambo Press.

02 (1) Shona Basic Course. 1965. Stevick. Washington, DC: FSI.

03 (3) Shona Language Lessons. 2nd ed. 1969. D. Fivaz & J. Ratzlaff. Salisbury: Word of Life Publications.

Swahili (086)

01 (1) Tujifunze Kiswahili. 1981. Wakhunga. Portland, OR: Portland State University Press.

02 (2) Kiswahili Kwa Kitendo: An Introductory Course. 1971. Zawani. New York: Harper & Row.

03 (3) Kiswahili: The Foundation For Speaking, Reading And Writing. 1979. T. Hinneman & S. Mirza. Washington, DC: University Press of America.

04 (2) Swahili Grammar. 2nd ed. 1964. E.O. Ashton. London: Longmans, Green & Co. (First pub. 1947)

Twi (097)

01 (1) Twi Basic Course. 1963. Redden. Washington, DC: FSI.

Wes Kos (512)

01 (1) An Introduction to West African Pidgin English. 1967. D. Dwyer. Lansing, MI: Michigan State University, African Studies Center.

Zulu (102)

01 (1) Say It In Zulu. 1981. Rycrohoff & Ngcobo. London: London University, School of Oriental and African Studies.

02 (1) Learn Zulu. 1970. C. Nyembezi. Pietermaritzburg, South Africa: Shuter and Shooter.